

Appendix 3

Cambridge East AAP Response Report

Cambridge East Area Action Plan

Public Participation Report

2. Towards a Spatial Strategy

CE1 Vision - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2. Towards a Spatial Strategy</i>				
<i>CE1 Vision - Preferred Approach</i>				
1180	Object	Consequential development could destroy greenbelt	The review of the Green Belt to accommodate the development of Cambridge East is established in the Structure Plan. It will be important to maintain the integrity of the Green Belt in the long term and to continue to have regard for the special qualities of Cambridge as a compact city with a rural setting of necklace villages.	
1727	Object	The fundamental implications of the move of Marshalls to new location (wherever that may be) have been ignored. Marshalls should stay where they are now and new houses build wherever Marshalls were to move to. That saves all the money connected with their proposed move and the forced imposition of Marshalls at their new site (wherever that may be).	This issue was carefully considered during the preparation of the Structure Plan, including the Examination in Public. It was concluded that Cambridge East offered the most sustainable location. Development at a greater distance from Cambridge would be less sustainable, encouraging longer journeys especially by car.	
7370	Object	The IWM is a conservation area!	South Cambridgeshire is considering designating the IWM site at Duxford as a Conservation Area, although it is not one at present. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1734	Object	A relocation of Cambridge Airport, and Marshalls, is key to the success of this plan and any such relocation would be detrimental to the environment of its new location. Development has taken place around Cambridge Airport for many years and those buying property there have done so with knowledge of its existence. This would not be the case for those who already live in any new location, other than Alconbury. Cambourne has been a great success; this type of development should be the way of the future. Take the pressure away from Cambridge. Build communities don't destroy them!	It will be important that the site chosen for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace would not be detrimental to the new location. In fact, flying has now not taken place at Alconbury for some years so many residents there have no experience of flying activity. The Structure Plan does include a new town proposal at Northstowe, specifically to achieve development early in the plan period. Cambridge East offers the highly sustainable opportunity as it is very close to Cambridge and by virtue of its scale can deliver the infrastructure, especially non-car transport better than another new town.	
7374	Object	The CE1 Vision also requires there to be a suitable site for Marshalls' relocation in order for it to be viable. A rural site for this relocation would create additional traffic and pressure on the existing, overloaded infrastructure. Therefore any site for Marshalls' relocation should dovetail with existing infrastructure improvement plans, for instance the output from the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi-modal study.	There continues to be further study into determining the most appropriate site for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. This continues in parallel with preparation of the Area Action Plan for Cambridge East. The traffic implications and infrastructure will be factors to take into account in site selection.	
7377	Object	The proposed use of the Duxford IWM site is not appropriate for economic reasons.	Marshall did consider that there were economic reasons why Duxford would be a suitable site, but following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7354	Object	The plan to relocate Marshalls is a huge exercise which must be carried out and approved locally before consideration is given to the use of the site.	It is acknowledged that the relocation of Marshall Aerospace is a huge exercise logistically. However, there would be significant gains from the development of the existing site for a new urban quarter in preference to an alternative site further from Cambridge. The Structure Plan which proposed the relocation was subject to considerable public participation and an examination in public. The Area Action Plan also offers the opportunity for further public participation in how the site should be developed.	
7356	Object	- Why move a brown-field site to a green-field one?	No decision has been made as to which is the most appropriate site for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. It could be another existing airfield and therefore also a brownfield site. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
1575	Object	This Plan should not be implemented unless and until arrangements are made for the relocation of Marshalls aerospace business which meet in all respects the policies and principles of both the Cambridgeshire County Structure Plan and, if applicable, the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework.	Work on identifying an appropriate location for Marshall Aerospace is continuing in parallel with the preparation of the Area Action Plan. The greater part of the development cannot be implemented until the airport has been relocated, although some early phases can be developed with the airport operational. The Area Action Plan will have regard to the policies and proposals in the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy of the South Cambs LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2061 2058	Object	There is a strong feeling in the village (Fulbourn) that opposes the pressure to make Marshalls Airport relocate.	The concern is noted. However, Cambridge Airport is identified in the Structure Plan as a location for major development and Marshall's has indicated that it is willing to relocate subject to an acceptable alternative site coming forward. Marshall is working actively with the local councils and Cambridgeshire Horizons to identify such a site.	
2444 2442 2543 2538 2532 2508 2503 2501 2499 2498 2496 2274 2362 2358 2357 2353 2350 2349 2346 2343 2338 2335 2334 2284 2280 2279 2276 1376	Object	Unless a satisfactory arrangement for relocation of Cambridge Airport is included in the Preferred Options Report the Area Action Plan is incomplete and unacceptable. No objection to redevelopment of the area North of Newmarket Road.	The development of Cambridge Airport is established in the Structure Plan, and the AAP Preferred Options Report acknowledges that the first phase north of Newmarket Road has to be planned either as a "stand-alone" development or as part of the wider and later development of the Airport. There will be a need to revisit the AAP to develop more details for the Airport site. Progress continues to be made on finding an alternative location for Marshall Aerospace; it is not considered that the final decision on an alternative site has to be made at this stage. The comment on North of Newmarket Road is noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7496	Object	There is a significant environmental cost in moving a large company.	While there is an environmental cost in moving a large company but they're are also opportunities to create a highly sustainable and therefore environmentally friendly new urban quarter on the existing site which actually produces a net gain to the environment, with sustainable transport links and exemplar projects of urban design and energy efficiency.	
7528 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd	Object	An alternative site exists outside the Green Belt, as a suitable location for a small new market town (14,000 dwellings max.), at Six Mile Bottom in a sustainable location linked by an existing rail route to Cambridge which it is proposed to upgrade to light rail LRT and which has excellent links to the national road network.	This alternative was considered during the Structure Plan process including scrutiny at the Examination in Public, and was dismissed. It is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to overthrow this strategic directive.	
2724	Object	The whole issue of closing the airfield needs to be thought about. All UK Cities and similar centres of high tech development have one or more General Aviation airfields. For example, Thames Valley and North Hampshire (Farnborough, Blackbushe, White Waltham ,Wycombe);Oxford (Kidlington and Enstone); Nottingham (Tollerton and Gamston). It is instructive to note the difference between Ipswich and Norwich. Norwich is prospering and has a thriving airport. Ipswich is declining having closed and redeveloped its airfield. Could this be the future picture of Oxford and Cambridge should Cambridge lose its well placed airfield? I firmly believe that planners greatly underestimate the positive impact of General Aviation on a local economy.	It is acknowledged that general aviation makes a contribution to the local economy. There are a number of flying activities currently undertaken at Cambridge Airport, but other locations exist for them to be relocated to. A key relocation will be that of Marshall Aerospace. This work is continuing in parallel with the development of the Area Action Pla.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1931	Object	The need for additional housing is based on demand during a housing market boom. The large extra supply of housing will intensify the effects of any downturn over the timescale of the plan.	The level of housing for the area has been established in both regional planning guidance and the Structure Plan and has been subject to considerable scrutiny, including various economic scenarios. However, the strategy reflects the continuing long term buoyancy of the area and the need to redress the current imbalance of housing compared with jobs close to Cambridge.	
6478 - Royal Mail Group	Object	Para 1.6 The Cambridge East Development will have a major impact on infrastructure, services and facilities in the area. This will include capacity of services of statutory undertakers. Recognition of this impact should be made within this paragraph and section. Further, comment is made that 'the area can be planned for, and all necessary infrastructure be secured from, all phases in the development'. A comment should be added that the direct impact of the development on all local services, facilities and infrastructure - including that for statutory undertakers to provide extra capacity to meet additional demand - shall be funded directly from the development.	The planning obligations placed on the developer of this site will need to take account of a number of matters, including the viability of the development, the priorities for services, facilities and infrastructure, what is reasonable for the development to bring forward, and the availability of other funding.	
7398	Object	The Duxford area does not need the extra employment Marshalls would bring.	Marshall Aerospace makes an important contribution to the local and national economy and it is important that an appropriate relocation site is found. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2101	Object	To pretend that a development of this size and proximity will "protect and enhance" the surrounding area is verbal garbage.	This is an important objective for the Area Action Plan. It is acknowledged that there will be change in the area, but every opportunity should be taken to achieve this objective.	
3405 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited 3415 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	In view of the uncertainty over the relocation of the airport, it must be questionable whether the eastern development is deliverable within a reasonable timescale. Additional options close to or on the edge of Cambridge should be identified to avoid a shortfall in supply.	Work on relocation is being undertaken in parallel with that of the Area Action Plan and progress continues to be made on identifying a suitable site. Alternative locations were considered during the Structure Plan process and found to be less satisfactory. The development strategy does not depend on the Airport coming forward at an early stage in the plan period.	
3873	Object	Object to the proposal to relocate Marshalls Airport in order to construct 10,000 dwellings on the site. The area is unsuitable for such a high density of houses.	The principle of developing the Airport is set out in the Structure Plan; the Area Action Plan seeks to guide how this development should take place. The Structure Plan also requires that Cambridge East be at high density and this is reflected in the approach being taken in the Area Action Plan.	
7573 7422 2155 7358	Object	The proposed development encroaches too close to Teversham and threatens the village atmosphere and identity.	Cambridge East is a location for major development identified in the Structure Plan. The Vision sets out the need for the development to be physically separate from Teversham to maintain its character. The extent and treatment of the area of separation is an important matter the AAP should address. It is proposed that the separation should be designated as Green Belt.	
7588	Object	Para 1.17 Implies only some of the Green Belt has value: this is wrong.	This matter was extensively debated at the Structure Plan Examination in Public, and the statement reflects the findings of that inquiry.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7587	Object	Para 1.14 The Green Belt should not be reviewed or diminished. All development should be restricted to brownfield sites.	The need to review the Green Belt is already established in Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan. If development were to be restricted to brownfield sites, the housing land requirement could not be met. A large proportion of development of Cambridge East will be on previously developed land.	
7552 7550 7589	Object	I hope that a full public inquiry will be forthcoming to discuss all the issues and that the proposals are not forced through for the convenience of political expediency.	The new local development framework process allows for full public participation including independent examination by a Government Inspector to test the soundness of the plan.	
7590	Object	Para 1.24 "effective protection of the environment" is a window-dressing statement, and highly disingenuous.	This statement is simply reproduced from the national strategy. It is an important objective that needs to be borne in mind in all planning decisions, not ignored.	
7548	Object	Any talk of sustainability must consider everywhere in the region, not just the East Cambridge development.	The Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan considered wider sustainability. Cambridge East was selected as a sustainable location for major development in that context. The Area Action Plan has to consider how the development can be made as sustainable as possible.	
7554	Object	Object to the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, and in particular Policy CE1. - no guarantees that Airport will relocate, even within the Plan period.	Work on finding a relocation site for Cambridge Airport is continuing in parallel with the preparation of the Area Action Plan and continues to make progress. The Area Action Plan Preferred Options report recognises that a review will be needed to give more detail about the Airport development when relocation and its timing is clearer. The focus of this first version of the AAP is to bring forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which can come forward with the Airport operating.	
5767	Object	Object	It is not clear which aspect of the Preferred Options report is the subject of this objection.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2522	Object	Object to houses being built at Cambridge City Airport on the following grounds: - Air services in and out of Cambridge would cease	Only very limited flying services are currently available at Cambridge Airport. Those such as General Aviation could be accommodated elsewhere. The key issue is to find a relocation site for Marshall Aerospace which is of national and local economic importance.	
2289	Object	I have been a resident in Duxford for the last seventeen years and feel that for this project to be as far forward as it is and for me not to have known about it until fairly recently there seems to be a lack in communications to the people who this development will affect the most.	This proposal was at a very early stage and was not included in any plans of the local district council. It was an option being explored by a commercial company. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
2972	Object	Object to policy CE1 as this suggests building on Marshall Cambridge Airport as this is a major business it will require relocating to another site in the area but policy CE1 makes no provision for this.	The development of Cambridge Airport is dependent on relocation of the existing activities. Work on determining an alternative location continues to make progress and that work continues in parallel with the preparation of the Area Action Plan. As the relocation site will be outside the Area Action Plan, it is not appropriate for it to form part of it.	
3758	Object	The vision should be more balanced by clearly referring to the existing surroundings of built up area and green belt and countryside. I think any new area should develop naturally from what is there now although the vision, as stated, may be applicable to the core of the new development.	These matters are currently contained within the Vision, and it is not clear how they could be more balanced as they refer to the relationship of the development with both the rural area and the fabric of the city.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3714 4202 4201	Object	Object to the proposal for the Cambridge Airport site to be redeveloped for housing and Marshall's moving to Duxford.	The Structure Plan identifies Cambridge Airport as a location for major development; the AAP details how this development should take place. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
3818 3816	Object	We are extremely angry at the news of Marshall's proposed move to Duxford. We have moved into our house in Duxford just over a year ago, after waiting for this dream location, since the houses were first put up for sale in the early eighties. This proposal was not found in our solicitors search prior to our move and we fail to see that now we have our choice, it should be blighted by the imposition of a major airfield next door.	This is not a proposal by the local planning authority, and was not put forward by Marshall's at the time of the search. It would therefore not be revealed by a past search. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4750 - Environment Agency	Object	The former uses of different areas of the site, including the airport, petrol filling station and a car works, could have led to the contamination of parts of the site. The Agency would suggest that the Strategic Masterplan & Design Guide for the site specifies the requirement for a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination. Subsequently, a report should be submitted, together with detailed proposals in line with current best practice for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless of such contamination, as may be found.	Information noted; a policy should be included in the AAP requiring a scheme of investigation, recording and treatment of any contamination. This will be an issue particularly in the development of the Masterplan and at other later stages in the planning process.	Include policy in the AAP requiring a scheme of investigation, recording and treatment of any contamination.
4752 - Environment Agency	Object	Land at the southern edge of the site, adjacent to Coldhams Lane and Rosemary Lane could be potentially at risk of landfill gas due to being in proximity to a former landfill site (location map enclosed showing land within 250 metres of the former landfill site). Appropriate land use or protection measures will need to be incorporated for this area.	Information noted; this is largely a matter for the Masterplan at a later more detailed stage of the planning process.	
4648 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Bayer CropScience Ltd generally supports the work that is being done to identify the development locations in line with the Structure Plan approach. It is clear that significant releases of Green Belt land will be required to meet Structure Plan housing targets. However the local development framework must clearly recognise that the development of previously developed land is a first priority under government policy guidance (PPG1 and 3). There is a real risk that the action area plan sites will not come forward fast enough to meet Structure Plan housing targets, due to the timetable involved in amending the Green Belt boundary, the need to reach agreement on challenging infrastructure requirements and commercial agreements between landowners and infrastructure providers before practical implementation can proceed.	A large proportion of development at Cambridge East will be on previously developed land. There are a number of locations on the edge of Cambridge identified in the Structure Plan where an early start on development can be made; at Cambridge East this is reflected in Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road. It is only the Airport site itself where the timing is uncertain because of the need to undertake more work on finding a relocation site. The Structure Plan recognises that this is a complex matter and that relocation is unlikely to happen until towards the end of the plan period. There is therefore time in which this can be achieved.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5148	Object	More housing needed north of Cambridge.	The general location of Cambridge East for housing has been established in the Structure Plan. There are already proposals for housing development on the Cambridge Northern Fringe and previous planning policies maintained an area of restraint south of Cambridge, thus putting a higher proportion of development northwards.	
5566 5565	Object	There have to be some AFFORDABLE houses for workers in the Cambridge area but object to the ones that are proposed for High Ditch Road which is partly in the Green Belt area, also the traffic in Fen Ditton is terrible now.	Affordable Housing is an important part of the overall scheme, and should be located in all parts of the development. The development of Cambridge East requires a review of the Green Belt and this is set out in the Structure Plan. There is no proposal to extend the development beyond High Ditch Road, and it will be important to have an appropriate landscape edge to the development to protect the rural character of that road. Traffic in Fen Ditton is exacerbated by the Ditton Lane link to the A14 which could be improved if a new interchange is agreed.	
5578 5569 2359 5216 1547	Object	Object to policy CE1 proposing that the Cambridge Airport site should be redeveloped for housing.	The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. The Structure Plan also sets a housing requirement on the City and District Councils which establishes the general scale of development at Cambridge East. The principle of this development was considered in detail at the Structure Plan Examination in Public and is therefore now accepted. It is for the Area Action Plan to set more detailed policies for this development within that strategic policy framework.	
6394	Object	Proposals to redevelop Cambridge Airport for housing are unacceptable: Addenbrooke's hospital is at capacity.	Matters such as the capacity of the health service were taken into account in the Structure Plan which sets the overall scale of development for the edge of Cambridge. The Area Action Plan must conform with the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6401 6399 1829	Object	Object to development on the green belt at Cambridge East.	The principle of releasing the Green Belt in this location was established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2c). The Area Action Plan will need to define the Green Belt boundaries taking this into account.	
7716 6398 7565 3872 2921 7495 7383 7553 3756 1568 1035	Object	This development will seriously harm the character, history and environment of the city and its surroundings.	These issues were extensively investigated during the Structure Plan EIP. As part of the evidence to that inquiry, South Cambridgeshire commissioned a special Green Belt Study which concluded that the development of land west of Airport Way would not damage the special qualities of Cambridge. It represents the opportunity to provide Cambridge with a new vibrant urban quarter which will enhance the City, providing much needed additional housing in a sustainable way, and the opportunity to accommodate facilities currently lacking in the City.	
7717 7581 7396 7480 7471 7638 7631	Object	Duxford is in the area of restraint and hence an unsuitable site for the relocation of Marshall's.	Whilst the Area of Restraint is a policy (SE6) in the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan on the basis of the policy in the 1995 Structure Plan (SP18/13 (i)), it is not included in the 2003 Structure Plan. No decision has been made to relocate Marshall aerospace to Duxford; Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3151 - Duxford PC 5571 - Thriplow Parish Council 4877 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 7702 6403 6295 6473 6344 6320 6318 6282 7722 7612 5130 7605 7530 3331 4423 7566 3426 3146 3119 3047 2810 2473 2330 3481 3121 3062 3010 2988 2924 2910 2481 7666 7662 5659	Object	<p>The Area Action Plan does not address the proposed move of Marshalls and hence is incomplete. The Structure Plan envisages development on the Cambridge Airfield if a suitable location is identified for a move by Marshall's Aerospace away from Cambridge Airport (reference paragraph 9.30).</p> <p>No such location has yet been identified. In this respect, therefore, the Cambridge East AAP should clearly be based on alternative bases: of no move by Marshall's Aerospace or no such move.</p> <p>The AAP appears to reflect uncertainty over timing, but not the fundamental uncertainty over whether any suitable site for relocation will be found.</p> <p>To be consistent with the Structure Plan, therefore, objection is made to the Cambridge East AAP in its current form, and it is proposed that the Plan be reconsidered in a form which makes no assumptions about the future development on the Cambridge Airport Site.</p>	<p>Development of Cambridge Airport is established in the Structure Plan, and the AAP Preferred Options Report acknowledges that the first phase north of Newmarket Road has to be planned either as a "stand-alone" development or as part of the wider and later development of the Airport. There will be a need to revisit the AAP to develop more details for the Airport site. Progress continues to be made on finding an alternative location for Marshall Aerospace; it is not considered that the final decision on an alternative site has to be made at this stage.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3191			
7382			
5573			
5557			
5544			
4801			
7540			
5254			
7629			
5165			
7616			
3984			
3351			
7465			
2320			
7543			
1935			
1552			
7402			
7360			
1544			
4523			
2139			
7380			
7375			
3079			
1929			
7363			
7351			
1851			
1582			
5643			
1764			
1735			
1798			
1669			

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7659 - Thriplow Parish Council 4764 - Environment Agency 7723 6536 7704 6513 6512 7706 5011 7574 7564 7551 7509 4286 7494 7455 7669 7668 5360 2011 7539 7421 5213 7464 7446 7542 1911 7303 1968 1956 1917 7361 1909 1648 7347 7331	Object	The infrastructure at present in and around Cambridge and the surrounding villages is already under pressure and is not capable of catering for this increase in population. This development will have serious impacts on traffic, public transport, health, education and water infrastructure.	The development of a new urban quarter will bring forward the need to improve infrastructure and it will be important to take into account the need to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring villages is protected.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7724 7456	Object	There is currently a 3% excess of property in Cambridge.	It is normal in the housing market for there to be a proportion of properties on the market at any one time. The level of housing for the area has been established in both regional planning guidance and the Structure Plan and has been subject to considerable scrutiny.	
6511 6510	Object	More houses in an over stretched area fails to tackle the root causes the problems. The root causes are: - uneven spread of industry and jobs across the country (create jobs in run down areas) - Uncontrolled population explosion (overcrowded island) - poor infrastructure connections to all parts of the country (railways)	The level of development in the Cambridge area has been established through the Regional Planning Guidance (RPG6) and the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. The Structure Plan identifies Cambridge East as a location for major development.	
7728 7678 7503 7431 7426 7420	Object	Marshall's move to Duxford would decrease the value of private property in the area.	Local concern about house values is noted; however, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7403	Object	Such major plans should not surprise residents, they should be suggested over time, allowing considered views to be debated by all interested parties.	The principle of development of Cambridge East was the subject of public participation and consultation at the Structure Plan stage. Marshall's suggested move to Duxford was a suggestion from that company. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7747 7440 7463 7373 7330	Object	Duxford was rejected in the first Arup report which agreed that it is unsuitable for Marshalls to move to. Why is it now being suggested as a strong contender?	Duxford was rejected in the 1st Arup Report. Marshall included it for consideration in the 2nd Arup Report, but Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7644 - The Thriplow Society 7708 7730 7749 7719 7521 7397 7485 7476 7432 7428 2105 7462 7453 7313 7338	Object	If Marshall's moves to Duxford consequential rerouting of the A505 will split the parish of Thriplow in two.	This concern is noted. A previous planning application for a bypass for the A505 at Heathfield was rejected by the District Council. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7742 7735 7738 7732 7753 7560 7546 7395 7563 7491 7488 7479 7438 7549 7372 7345 7340 7334	Object	There are more suitable sites for the relocation of Marshall's other than Duxford, such as Bourn, Wyton, Waterbeach or Alconbury.	No decision has been made on the selection of any site for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. Marshall commissioned Arup to prepare a report on potential sites, and Wyton, Waterbeach and Alconbury are included as possible locations as well as Duxford. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7423	Object	If this development does go ahead, it should be much smaller, and should not come any closer to Teversham than 500 metres. The land inbetween should remain in the Green Belt.	The overall scale of development is largely dictated by the Structure Plan. However, the issue of the degree of separation for Teversham is an important issue which will need to be addressed in determining Green Belt boundaries.	
7513	Object	Would object to any proposal to move Marshalls to Duxford Imperial War Museum on the grounds of proximity to a Conservation Area.	The IWM is not a Conservation Area although the District Council is considering designating it as such. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7409 7514	Object	Would object to any proposal to move Marshalls to Duxford Imperial War Museum on the grounds of the existing runway length being too short.	The Arup report recognises that the runway at Duxford would have to be lengthened in order to accommodate Marshall's requirements. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7439	Object	A local councillor has a lot to gain from the sale of his land whose best interests did he have at heart .	This is not substantiated nor is it relevant to the Area Action Plan.	
7448	Object	Mass public transport is an obsolete 20th century concept incompatible with modern working practices and lifestyles.	Not accepted. There are increasing concerns in the 21st century about the impact of the car; increased use of public transport is essential to tackle problems of congestion, pollution and climate change.	
7450	Object	We have no objection to 100 or even 200 houses, but the impact of the sheer vastness of scale of the development has not been considered in what we believe would be a devastating over-population.	The overall scale of development in this location has already been established in the Structure Plan. The Area Action Plan has to be in conformity with this plan. 200 houses would not deliver the required amount of housing.	
7451	Object	Many businesses are locating outside of Cambridge and employees are not automatically drawn to live in Cambridge centre and commute outwards. The Cambourne new town is the blueprint to place development away from what is already a highly densely populated centre and environs of Cambridge, which is in essence a city of education and tourism.	The Structure Plan already makes provision for a new town at Northstowe for the early part of the plan period. It also is a response to the need to provide more houses close to Cambridge to address the current imbalance with jobs. Cambridge East will make a major contribution to this.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6346 7585 7436 7435 7418 7413 3710	Object	object to the possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to the Imperial War Museum in Duxford. The proximity to Stansted would make commercial flights non-viable.	Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7586 7537 7302	Object	It should NOT be up to commercial entities to influence the decisions of the South Cambs District Council to the detriment of the heritage of Cambridge Airport and ultimately Duxford Airfield.	In fact, the Structure Plan identified Cambridge Airport as a sustainable location for major development. Marshall's did not initiate this proposal but have indicated a willingness to vacate the site if a suitable alternative location can be found.	
7592	Object	Para 1.47 34% is far too low, and is not consistent with the figure of 65% in para 1.57 or with public statements by Government.	These Structure Plan targets for the use of previously developed land relate to South Cambs (34%) and the City (65%), recognising that a rural area has few brownfield sites. Government figures take account of a national picture which includes conurbations where most of the brownfield land is.	
7350 7349	Object	This Policy fails to achieve its CE1 vision. Any plan considering this area MUST fully encumber, require and guarantee: - The impact on workers at the Airport. It would be ill conceived to embark on such a vision without fully addressing this issue. I do not believe this criterion has currently been met. Without doing so would undermine the use and validity of the policy.	The needs of Marshall Aerospace are important. They have indicated that not all Marshall's jobs would need to be relocated. Marshall Aerospace have also indicated that they could only vacate the existing site once an alternative site had been found.	
7518	Object	Growth will add to congestion because of increased commuting.	This is not accepted. The whole purpose of developing close to Cambridge is to redress the current imbalance of housing and jobs which has led to increased commuting.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3237 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd 7470 7559 7558 7346	Object	It is entirely inappropriate to make the implementation of a major policy in the LDF dependent upon the investment decisions of a private company and which involves moving an airport and massive infrastructure and environmental costs. Such a policy is unrobust and lacks certainty and ignores the considerations of the local people.	Cambridge Airport is identified in the Structure Plan as a location for major development; the AAP will give more detail about the nature of the development. The issues raised about investment decisions of a private company and the complications of relocation were acknowledged during the EiP into the Structure Plan. Marshall continue to indicate that they are prepared to relocate subject to agreeing a new site for the aerospace activities. Progress continues to be made on this although it is not a matter for the AAP.	
6409 6410 7665	Object	Marshall's move to the Imperial War Museum would destroy the integrity of the museum and be detrimental to the memory of all those airmen who served for our country.	South Cambridgeshire's current policies recognise the unique historic qualities of the IWM site at Duxford. Marshall has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7682 7681 3887 3886 7529 3845 7535 7510 7667 7663 4788 7658 7522 2045 7599 7449 7622 4910 1554 7311 7355 7310 1538 4249 1211 7368 7352 1791 7335	Object	Unqualified objection to Marshall's moving to Duxford.	It is assumed that this objection only relates to the Marshall's at Duxford issue and that if Duxford is not selected as the site for relocation, then there is no objection to the vision for Cambridge East. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7406 7404	Object	It is worrying to see that there is no alternative plan should this site not become available for development. We wish to have an assurance written into the Local Development Framework that, should Marshalls not become available, that this development does not be located in the Rural Centres but become the subject of further consultation and planning.	The LDF cannot suggest an alternative strategy, that would be incompatible with Government guidance. However, the point is accepted that the scale of development proposed for Cambridge East would not be acceptable or sustainable to be located at a range of Rural Centres which are the lowest in the development sequence and are at the margins of sustainability.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7606 7362	Object	Relocating Marshall's will be an expensive exercise.	It is recognised that the relocation of Marshall Aerospace is expensive and logistically complex. However, Cambridge Airport is identified in the Structure Plan as a location for major development and Marshall's has indicated that it is willing to release the site subject to a satisfactory alternative location being agreed. Work is currently in progress to identify such a site.	
7607	Object	Shortage of public sector workers and skills, where will they be housed to cater for the expanded population.	One of the important reasons for the development of Cambridge East is to provide Affordable Housing for local people and key workers. The current shortage of such housing exacerbates the shortage of skilled and public sector workers.	
7609 7608 7604	Object	Concern about the environmental impact on Teversham and the surrounding area.	The location of Cambridge East has already been determined through the Structure Plan. The Area Action Plan must consider what policies are needed to ensure that the environmental impact is minimised and mitigated.	
7610 - Teversham Parish Council 7538 7541	Object	Object to the proposal to develop the existing Marshalls site. - The current airport site forms a green break between the City and surrounding villages	It is agreed that the existing airport does provide separation between the City and villages. The Area Action Plan will need to ensure continued Green Belt separation to ensure the maintenance of village character and identity and the continued setting of Cambridge itself.	
7613	Object	Proposals to redevelop Cambridge Airport for housing are unacceptable, this is a rural area and it should be kept that way.	The principle of developing Cambridge Airport was established in the Structure Plan; the Area Action Plan has to guide how this development should take place.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7615	Object	Object to Duxford being used by Marshalls: overflying of village will be unwelcome, particularly from larger aircraft.	Objection noted; however, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7447	Object	Too much emphasis is put on cycling. Considering the UK climate, the topography of the route into Cambridge from the site in question is not flat, is a significant distance and there is an increasingly aged population. Cycling in the UK will never be mass public transport option. Comparisons with The Netherlands are unrealistic.	Not accepted. There is a great opportunity to achieve a high proportion of journeys by cycle, thus making a contribution to sustainability and health and addressing concerns such as global warming. Cambridge East is within cycling distance of the city centre, and journeys within Cambridge East should also be made attractive to cycling. Not all the Netherlands are totally flat.	
7555	Object	Object to the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, and in particular Policy CE1. - RPG6 is to be superseded.	RSS14 will supersede RPG6 but the draft assumes that the strategy is continued into the years 2016 - 2021, and does not retract the review of the Green Belt and development on the edge of Cambridge, rather it confirms it.	
7593	Object	Para 1.48 It is not explained why the Green Belt must be sacrificed, when development could be restricted to brownfield sites.	This is a matter largely dealt with at the Structure Plan. Given the scale of growth which the Cambridge area has to deliver, and the lack of brownfield sites on any large scale in the area, it is inevitable that a review of the Green Belt is necessary in order to provide housing close to Cambridge where it will be more sustainable. The PPG3 definition of brownfield land includes the entire curtilage of airfields.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7594	Object	Para 1.57 See above. Also, final sentence gives no confidence whatsoever that future destruction of the Green Belt will not occur, as this is exactly why the greenbelt was created in the first place.	The review of the Cambridge Green Belt is a requirement of Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan. Although Government guidance indicates that Green Belt boundaries should endure for a period longer than the development plan period, it also recognises that there may be exceptional reasons for a review.	
7643 - The Thriplow Society	Object	Object to the proposal to move Marshalls to Duxford: damaging for biodiversity.	Concern noted. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7712 7309 7324	Object	Proposals ill considered, benefit only Cambridge housing plans and marginally only for Marshalls.	The Structure Plan identifies the site for development. This was the subject of an examination in public by an independent panel who endorsed the proposal. Marshall's indicated a willingness to vacate the site if a suitable alternative location could be found. It is for the Area Action Plan to guide how this development should take place.	
5014 - Teversham Parish Council 7713 6525 7407 7405 5266	Object	Marshalls provides a range of employment opportunities not offered by the high tech firms moving into this area. Marshall's make an important contribution to the local economy and should be retained in its current location.	This is acknowledged; that is why it is important to establish an alternative location for Marshall Aerospace. It is understood that not all Marshall Aerospace jobs would be relocated - a number would be retained in Cambridge. Progress continues to be made on identifying an alternative site.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7714 4394	Object	Objection to the building on this scale of up to 14500 houses on the Marshalls site.	The principle of this location for major development was set down in the Structure Plan. The Area Action Plan cannot over-ride this. The Preferred Options Report suggests the site could accommodate up to around 12,00 dwellings. (para 6.6)	
5237 - The Thriplow Society 7572 7525 2304 7785 2759 7434 7617 2425 7316 7376 7364	Object	Marshalls' move to Duxford will seriously damage the environment of nearby villages and the local area.	Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7703	Object	Proposals to redevelop Cambridge Airport for housing are unacceptable: This is a rural area and it should be kept that way.	The principle of the development of Cambridge Airport for housing is already established in the Structure Plan; the Area Action Plan needs to determine how that development should take place. It will also take into account the need to maintain or opportunities to enhance rural character. Although largely open in character, Cambridge Airport is defined as a large brownfield site.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6023 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 7701 6407 7705 5141 7536 5666 2361 4811 7445 7359 7591 7516 7353 7336	Object	Where is the evidence that so many houses are required in this region; are the projections of need justified; where are these people coming from? Too much emphasis on building in the south-east - development should be redirected to the north of England. Not convinced that economy of Cambridge will continue at current rate of growth.	The housing requirement for the area has been established through the preparation and examination of the Regional Planning Guidance (RPG6) and the Structure Plan. The resultant development strategy takes account of the current imbalance of jobs and houses, the continued economic buoyancy of the area and the need to provide Affordable Housing. Cambridge East is a location specified in the Structure Plan.	
7715 7675 7656 7653 7628 7515	Object	If Marshalls move this will lead to increased traffic on already congested roads in Cambridge especially Newmarket Road.	There will need to be improvements to public transport and cycleways to encourage a high level of usage of these modes. The Area Action Plan will need to bring forward appropriate improvements to the transport network.	
7756 7389 7481 7472 7412 7632	Object	Object to Marshall's moving to Duxford as there are several listed buildings in the museum and in the area which should be protected.	No decision has been made as to which is the most appropriate site for the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. It could be another existing airfield and therefore also a brownfield site. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7655 7652	Object	Where will the people employed in Marshalls work?	Marshall's has indicated publicly that if it relocates its Aerospace activities, only those directly needed at the new location would be moved, whilst a significant number would remain in Cambridge. Other employment in the Marshall Group, such as car sales and maintenance would also remain. The Area Action Plan will also make provision for additional employment.	
7657 7654	Object	Who will cycle and use the buses as stated?	The development of a new urban quarter on this scale close to Cambridge provides one of the best opportunities in the country to encourage cycling - advantageous for both environmental reasons and for health reasons. The provision of public transport from development on this scale will also be more viable than if scattered.	
7672 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Fen Ditton should be affected as little as possible by additional traffic.	Agreed that this principle should be taken into account in developing the transport strategy for Cambridge East.	
7673 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Fen Ditton should be affected as little as possible by necessary facilities becoming overloaded including health and policing.	Concerns noted; it will be important that the Area Action Plan ensures provision of adequate facilities in Cambridge East to serve its population and not place stress on existing facilities elsewhere.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7611 - Teversham Parish Council 7676 4205 7497 7671 3516 5227 3517 5263 1085	Object	Marshall's relocating means job losses and increased commuting as employees travel further to work, and hence more traffic on the roads	The relocation of Marshall Aerospace should not result in a net loss of jobs if an alternative location can be established; work is continuing on identifying the most suitable location. Given that Cambridge Airport is identified in the Structure Plan, the AAP is required to provide more detail as to how development will take place. Many of Marshall's current employees live at a distance from Cambridge because of the high cost of housing; the changes to journeys to work are likely to be mixed with some employees travelling further but some might actually travel less. Marshall's has indicated publicly that if it relocates its Aerospace activities, only those directly needed at the new location would be moved, whilst a significant number would remain in Cambridge. Other employment in the Marshall Group, such as car sales and maintenance would also remain. The Area Action Plan will also make provision for additional employment.	
7731	Object	We feel if permission was to be granted to development of this size it will be intolerable to live with and hope that local residents health and wellbeing are considered by our local council.	It will be important to consider the health implications of all developments, for both existing residents and for the future residents of the development in question. The development of the new urban quarter offers a highly sustainable solution to providing housing numbers on this scale.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7647 - The Thriplow Society 7688 7755 7748 7683 7674 6402 7598 7567 7519 7580 2991 2900 7651 7388 7384 5531 5530 7469 2600 2596 7419 7637 7630 7624 7532 7312 7306 1970 7381 7367 7317 7499 1739	Object	If Marshall's were to move to Duxford this would result in development in the Green Belt in this area.	It is acknowledged that the location at Duxford put forward in the Arup report would include Green Belt land and would require a review of the Green Belt boundary. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities .	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7761 7729 7759 7391 7490 7757 7760 7414 7614 7348 7326 7319 7318 7323	Object	The development and re-location of the A505 will damage villages, wild life and areas of historic interest in the surrounding area.	These concerns are noted; however, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7645 - The Thriplow Society 7746 7744 7739 7711 7699 7762 7725 7691 7752 7685 7721 3856 7583 4203 7695 7505 7457 7392 7466 2654 7758 2115 7640 7635 7626 7619 5146 7460 7452 2239 7441 7399 1386 7512 7369 1801 4996	Object	To Marshall's move to Duxford this will result in unacceptable increases in noise from increased traffic levels, numbers of aircraft, aircraft engine testing and development in the area.	This concern is noted;however, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1603 7321 1760				
7764	Object	Marshall's is long established where it is. Find a more suitable location or better still leave it where it belongs.	Marshall's have indicated that they would be prepared to move to an alternative site to enable the development of the existing airport, which offers a highly sustainable location for a new urban quarter. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities. Work is continuing in parallel with the preparation of the Area Action Plan to determine the most appropriate relocation site. The Structure Plan identifies the site for development of a new urban extension to Cambridge.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5543 - Thriplow Parish Council 6429 6428 7741 7707 7700 6408 7754 7718 4798 3888 7568 7582 7545 7696 7506 7493 7650 7444 7390 7385 7482 7473 7639 7633 7531 7461 7443 2035 7307 7379 7365 7328 1593 7767 7498 7339 7333	Object	The relocation of Marshall's to Duxford will spoil the unique historic nature of the Imperial War Museum, which is an international tourist attraction and a listed historic site.	The historic and tourism importance of the IWM site at Duxford is recognised and will need to be taken into account in any development proposal. South Cambridgeshire's current planning policies recognise the special nature of the site, and work is in progress on preparing a Conservation Area taking into account the proposed Listing of a number of buildings. Any future proposals would have to be considered in this context. The historic and tourism importance of the IWM site at Duxford is recognised and will need to be taken into account in any development proposal. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7733 6400 7736 7727 7751 7595 7569 7561 7544 7459 7387 7437 7429 7625 7623 7534 7442 7378 7371 7327 7325 7768 7344 7332	Object	A move of Marshall's to Duxford would raise safety concerns in that it was operating near the busy M11 and nearby villages with schools.	Health and safety issues, and any risk assessment would be considered if it was proposed to relocate Marshall Aerospace to the IWM site at Duxford. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7417 7416 7415	Object	Object to the moving of Marshalls to Duxford for the due to: Loss of amenities (Petrol station / shops) Very low unemployment rate locally Loss of bus route (public / school)	Concerns noted. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7547	Object	Consideration of the green belt in East Cambridge needs to be consistent with a consideration of the green belt implications for the new Marshall's site. At Duxford, the green belt would suffer. Overall, any gains in amenities in East Cambridge must not be paid for by losses inflicted elsewhere.	Concern noted. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7646 - The Thriplow Society 7709 7487 7478 2219 7621 7533 7454 7401 7308 7786 7601 7320 7342	Object	The infrastructure around Duxford will be unable to cope if Marshall's were to move into the area.	Any development should demonstrate that either the existing infrastructure would support it or the development would need to improve the infrastructure. However, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
7660 - Thriplow Parish Council	Object	The likely damage to the environment by development at Cambridge East is unacceptable.	Cambridge East offers the most sustainable location for a development of this scale because of its proximity to Cambridge and the use of previously developed land. It is preferable to developing a greenfield site further from Cambridge. The principle of developing Cambridge East has been established in the Structure Plan; the Area Action Plan will deal with how this development should take place.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7771	Object	Marshalls moving to Duxford would bring considerable problems: light pollution..	Concern noted; however Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7648 - The Thriplow Society 7527 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd 7745 7743 7740 7734 6393 7737 6404 6345 7680 7679 6337 7597 7571 7570 3871 7773 7520 3523 6392 7508 7504 7502 7501 2915 7492 7664 5663 5651 7394 2034 7386 7661 7467 7489 7484	Object	If Marshall's moves to Duxford the surrounding villages communities and rural character will be ruined.	Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7486			
7477			
7475			
7433			
7430			
2176			
7427			
7425			
7424			
7766			
7408			
7649			
7634			
7627			
5185			
7620			
3353			
3267			
2295			
7315			
7357			
1084			
7763			
7511			
7366			
7603			
7602			
7329			
7322			
7500			
7343			
7337			
1709			

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7779 - The Thriplow Society 7780 7782 7781 7690 7684 7777 7769 7411 7618 7774 7776 7600 7341	Object	Marshall's move to Duxford will increase pollution in the area, from traffic and aircraft.	Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7642 - The Thriplow Society 6427 7710 7698 7726 7692 7687 7750 7686 7677 7720 7596 7562 7584 7579 7694 7507 7458 7670 7526 2303 7770 7393 3869 7468 7483 7474 7410 7641 7636 7772 7775 7314 7400 7765 7778 7783	Object	Marshall's move to Duxford will greatly increase traffic in the area, exacerbating existing congestion problems and damaging the local environment.	No decision has been made to relocate Marshall Aerospace to Duxford. Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequent Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7557 7556	Object	Object in particular Policy CE1. - Vision does not represent a sustainable approach to planning. - Vision is a blinkered response.	Not accepted. The objection is not substantiated. The Vision aims to ensure a sustainable approach.	
1581	Support	Although supporting the vision it is the timing that is wrong. Marshall's should not be given any encouragement to move because of the contribution they make to the Cambridge economy.	Support noted. It is acknowledged that Marshall's make a significant contribution to the local economy. Marshall's have indicated that they are prepared to relocate if an alternative site can be identified. The Structure Plan recognises that this will take place towards the end of the plan period. Marshall's supported this approach during the preparation of and public examination into the Structure Plan. The Area Action Plan will reflect this.	
1802 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports both Preferred Approaches, which help set the context for promoting and achieving a modern, vibrant and distinctive urban quarter.	Support noted.	
3363	Support	Generally supportive of the vision, but I do not believe that a "corridor" of green space will fulfill the objective of maintaining a separate village identity for Teversham or Fen Ditton.	Support noted; the extent and treatment of green separation will be a key consideration in the Area Action Plan.	
2232	Support	There's an uneven division of responsibility between the councils, and South Cambs will gain more in council tax than it will provide in services. City residents must not be picking up that bill in their council tax.	This is not a matter for the Area Action Plan.	
3104	Support	Sports centre needed for Abbey residents. Improved facilities for existing Abbey ward children of all ages, especially teenagers, for pensioners and for other residents.	Noted. Paragraph 8.5 of the Preferred Options Report indicates that the need to provide such as facility as part of the Cambridge East development is being actively considered.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3201 - FPDSavills (Two sites South of Coldhams Lane)	Support	The District Council are advised that Land Securities are promoting land south of Coldhams Lane, Cambridge and south of "Cambridge East Area". Formal submissions will be made to the City Council's Redeposit Draft on the basis of sustainability credentials, site characteristics and the site's previous identification for development within the 2001 DEGW Study.	Noted.	
2647	Support	The vision needs to include horseriding and bridleways for the residents of the area, as well as access to the existing and hopefully improved bridleway network.	Support noted. It is agreed that bridleways are important, and CE74 sets out the preferred approach to developing a strategy for countryside access which includes bridleways.	
2912 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council supports the CE1 vision.	Support noted.	
4473 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the vision for Cambridge East. The vision builds on the policy aims of Policy P9/2c of the Structure Plan.	Support noted.	
5686 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall has prepared a Draft Development Principles/Strategic Masterplan at a strategic level for the proposed development in Cambridge East. This document is a helpful starting point for more detailed discussion. Marshall intends to focus further work on North of Newmarket Road, to help support a planning application for possible submission in 2006.	Support noted. The work undertaken by Marshall will help inform the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5687 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is willing to co-operate with the authorities in achieving a major urban extension at Cambridge East, so long as appropriate sites could be found and made available to rehouse Marshall Aerospace, Marshall SV and parts of the Motor Group. Subsequently, various studies have been commissioned, which at November 2004 suggest that Aerospace relocation might take place at Duxford or Wyton. Marshall SV and parts of the Motor Group plan to relocate to Swavesey. Marshall Motor Group intends to remain and consolidate at Newmarket Road, Cambridge.	Support noted.	
6341	Support	I strongly support the relocation of Cambridge Airport so as to reduce noise for residents. I would therefore support anything in the East Area Action Plan which would help the relocation as soon as possible.	Support noted.	
6406	Support	The development south of Newmarket Road will fill a, while green belt, non too attractive gap between the City in the west and Cherry Hinton, which is a suburb of Cambridge anyway.	Support noted;however, there will still be a need to maintain green corridors to maintain the local distinctiveness and character of differing parts of the City.	

Decision on CE1 Vision - Preferred Approach

Pursue the Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE2 Cambridge East Development Principles - Preferred Approach</i>				
1226	Object	What is shown cannot be said to be "physically separate from Teversham" any more than it will be separate from Cherry Hinton. The Green corridor cannot replace the sense of space there is at present. It is idealistic to suppose the new population would have low car dependency. The new cars will add to the existing traffic congestion.	The issue of the extent and treatment of green separation will be dealt with in more detail in a separate part of the Area Action Plan, although it is important to present the principle in Development Principles. It is considered that the approach taken will maintain physical separation, village identity and setting. The development of a new urban quarter at high density offers the best opportunity to achieve low car dependency, important to address issues of congestion, pollution and climate change.	
1584	Object	Should include a bullet point about a country park to the east of Airport way.	Whilst it is not necessary to form this as a separate bullet it could helpfully qualify the 2nd bullet.	Amend 2nd bullet to read: - "...and a new country park to the east of Airport Way and south of Newmarket Road."
1622 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge	Object	No alternative strategy has been developed should the airport not move. Pressure should not be put on Marshall's to move.	The principle of the development of Cambridge Airport is established in the Structure Plan. The Area Action Plan will set out how that development should take place. Marshall's has indicated that it is willing to relocate subject to an acceptable alternative site coming forward. The Area Action Plan will recognise the need to review the AAP and when this is done there should be a clearer understanding of the timing of the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. Work is continuing in parallel with the preparation of the AAP to establish the most appropriate site for relocation and progress continues to be made on that matter. It would not be appropriate for the AAP to suggest an alternative strategy as this would not provide certainty.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2747 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The Trust supports the general thrust of the development principles but objects to the fact that the need to provide Community facilities is not included as a development principle.	Support noted. However, the 3rd bullet point includes the need to "include facilities which can help serve the existing as well as the new community" which is intended to cover both commercial and community facilities. However, a new bullet point could be added: - provide an appropriate level of commercial and community facilities to meet the needs of its residents.	Add new bullet: - provide an appropriate level of commercial and community facilities to meet the needs of its residents.
2926	Object	The principles only consider what is being created in East Cambridge, and not to what is being displaced (i.e. Marshalls). The principles need to include statements about acceptable criteria for the displaced business' new location.	Not accepted. The Area Action Plan cannot form planning policy for areas beyond its boundaries.	
6480 - Royal Mail Group	Object	<p>RMG support the principle of the Cambridge East major development as set out in the Area Action Plan. However, this major development is likely to have a significant affect upon the capacity of the RMG facilities serving Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. These include Mail Centre, Delivery Office and Local Depot.</p> <p>In this regard there is likely to be a requirement to extend these facilities to support the essential role that RMG provide in delivery postal services to all residential and commercial premises in the area. The requirement and support of the provision of new and expansion of existing facilities needs to be identified in the policy.</p>	It would not be appropriate to single out the requirements at this formative stage. The development principles recognise that there is a need to provide facilities commensurate with the needs of the development and the AAP will identify a requirement for the development to provide for appropriate services and facilities to serve its needs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3270 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd	Object	<p>The policy is un-robust as it places the implementation of a major policy in the Development Plan dependent upon the investment and business decisions of a private company.</p> <p>No appropriate site exists for the removal of Marshall's Airfield which will not cause immense environmental harm and serious harm to the amenities of residents.</p> <p>An alternative site exists outside the Green Belt at Six Mile Bottom in a sustainable location linked by an existing rail route to Cambridge which it is proposed to upgrade to light rail LRT and which has excellent links to the national road network.</p>	<p>Not agreed. This is a strategic matter which was fully considered in the preparation of the Structure Plan, including the Examination in Public. The Area Action Plan cannot overturn this strategy, but is required to show how the development should take place.</p>	
2364	Object	<p>Key planning principles have been ignored and assumptions flawed. Development should instead be located further afield from Cambridge, e.g. at such locations as Cambourne.</p>	<p>The strategy has been developed in the higher order plans of Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan which set a sequence of development in which the edge of Cambridge comes ahead of the new town at Northstowe. Northstowe is being brought forward to allow development early in the plan period. There is no provision for a second new town, which, in any case, would be less sustainable than Cambridge East which is an extension to Cambridge with its services and facilities and offers the opportunity to minimise the length and environmental impact of travel.</p>	
3195 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	<p>Arlington generally support the development principles outlined in this section, but have concerns regarding the amount of housing and high density proposed due to its potential impact on promoting "The Cambridge Phenomenon". The need for housing should not conflict with the objectives for future employment generation and growth.</p>	<p>This general support is noted. However, the Structure Plan is clear that there is a need to provide more housing close to Cambridge to correct the current imbalance with employment. The shortage of housing, with a consequent lack of workers would hamper the continued development of the Cambridge economy. To provide a higher level of employment than suggested would merely perpetuate the current problems.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2626 - East of England Development Agency	Object	The overall vision set out in policy CE2 is supported. However, EEDA would wish to see the vision for this significant site take on board the contribution that Cambridge's pre-eminent global leadership role in science and technology research and development by enabling and facilitating cluster expansion, particularly that associated with world renowned research institutes and encourage complementary economic linkages with other sub-regions to reinforce Cambridge's national and international functions and status.	The Structure Plan is quite clear that the primary purpose of the strategy is to redress the current imbalance of housing and jobs close to Cambridge in order to support the Cambridge economy. This matter is more fully addressed at CE21.	
2536 - RAVE	Object	This Principle should include a further bullet point to read as follows: . Be defined by a principled assessment of the Green Belt function to establish the land which can be released from the Green Belt without detriment to the fundamental objectives which the Green Belt is established to achieve.	It is agreed that the Green Belt should be referred to in the Development Principles reflecting the Structure Plan Policy P9/2b. It is suggested that this would be appropriate as follows: "- define the boundaries of the Green Belt to retain as Green Belt that land which is required to maintain the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt."	Include new bullet as follows: "- define the boundaries of the Green Belt to retain as Green Belt that land which is required to maintain the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt."
3730 - GO-East	Object	Section 19 - Planning Obligations The submission DPD (or subsequent review of the AAP for the main part of the Airport site) will need to set out more comprehensively the range of site specific facilities which developers will be expected to contribute towards or provide in full.	Noted, but the Preferred Options report does suggest the general level of requirements, although this will need to be refined in later stages, both in a review of the AAP (for the Airport site), and in Masterplanning and later stages in the planning process.	
3759	Object	The principles as stated should allow for preservation or avoiding encroachment onto the existing green corridor between Fen Ditton and the Fison's road housing area.	This is covered in the 1st bullet. However, a more detailed section on separation from villages in the Area Action Plan will make this more explicit.	
5053 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	The report does not address the question of how the development will be administered. This is particularly important for the management of open spaces since confusion over responsibilities could deny areas proper maintenance.	Agreed that this is an important matter. This matter is, in fact, addressed at CE53 which sets out the preferred approach that the landownership of public open space should be as simple as possible and subject to a single agreed management plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4533	Object	"Physically separate" must be defined, or it is a valueless concept. Similarly for "net increased in biodiversity": biodiversity of what, and by how much? Inconsistent references to "increasing" or "maximising" biodiversity between CE2 and chapter 10 - para 10.13.	The Area Action Plan will set out some definitions, such as the width of the Green Corridor and separation from villages, but more precise definitions for some matters will be more appropriately dealt with at Masterplanning and other later stages in the planning process. It is not considered that there is an inconsistency in the Development Principles and CE2, a net increase in biodiversity across the site can only be achieved by maximising opportunities to do so.	
4552	Object	Roads and infrastructure first - houses second. David Kellaway made many pertinent points which we support.	Roads and other infrastructure are important. However, if any infrastructure improvements are to be provided by the development, account will have to be taken of the capital requirements necessary to make the development viable, and the point in the progress of development when any particular part of the infrastructure should come forward. Some infrastructure will need to be provided by other agencies, for example A14 improvements to be provided by the Highways Agency are necessary and not dependent on the development of Cambridge East.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4872 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Object to the view that the site will be physically separate from the nearby villages, especially Fen Ditton and Teversham, to maintain their character and the attributes of Cambridge as a city surrounded by a necklace of villages. The preferred approach does not accord with the requirements of the Structure Plan, in particular P9/2a and P9/2b. CE2 is using a different interpretation to P9/2b in that physical features are being used to create a break where as the structure plan is seeking spatial separation. There are concerns with the approach being promoted which could ultimately result in Fen Ditton and Teversham being engulfed by the expansion of Cambridge, which P9/2a and P9/2b are clearly seeking to prevent.	This objection seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the term "physically separate" in the 1st bullet. Here "physically" is intended to represent a geographic or spatial separation not merely a separation based on a physical feature on the ground. Nevertheless, it should be recognised that physical features in the landscape can enhance the perception of separation.	
6173	Object	Key planning principles have been ignored and assumptions are flawed. We have no objection to 100 or even 200 houses, but the impact of the sheer vastness of scale of the development has not been considered in what we believe would be a devastating over-population. Many businesses are locating outside of Cambridge and employees are not automatically drawn to live in Cambridge centre and commute outwards the Cambourne new town is the blueprint to place development away from what is already a highly densely populated centre and environs of Cambridge, which is in essence a city of education and tourism.	The Structure Plan already makes provision for a new town at Northstowe for the early part of the plan period. The Structure Plan strategy is a response to the need to provide more houses close to Cambridge to address the current imbalance with jobs. Cambridge East will make a major contribution to this.	
6174	Object	Employers should support housing needs - self-fulfilling growth.	The development of a compact high density urban quarter offers the best chance of achieving modal shift which is essential to address issues of congestion, pollution and climate change.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
922 - The National Trust	Support	Support CE2 but suggest that the 2nd bullet point contains reference to the opportunity for linkage to the strategic open space that will be formed by the National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision.	It is appropriate to note that the Wicken Fen Vision will be relevant to Cambridge East because of its ultimate proximity. This could be added to the 2nd bullet as suggested.	Amend 2nd bullet so that it reads: - Connect the green spaces of Cambridge through to the countryside with a green corridor linking through to Coldhams Common LINKING TO a new country park, TO THE EAST OF AIRPORT WAY AND SOUTH OF NEWMARKET ROAD, AND THE NATIONAL TRUST'S WICKEN FEN VISION.
1803 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports both Preferred Approaches, which help set the context for promoting and achieving a modern, vibrant and distinctive urban quarter.	Support noted.	
2767	Support	I strongly support all the aims as set out here and can think of nothing important that has been missed.	Support noted.	
6443 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We welcome the development principles for the new urban quarter set out in the Preferred Approach. In particular, we welcome the commitments to 'connect the green spaces of Cambridge through to the countryside with a new green corridor..' and to 'use green spaces and water features to contribute to the character of the area.'	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2112	Support	Bullet point No. 2 will only be a reality if the Green spaces are joined up physically, by putting sections of roads underground. Until then it will not be a corridor, but a series of Green blocks, and should be referred to as such, to prevent misleading the public.	Noted. It is agreed that the way in which there will need to be physical joining of the various green spaces is an important matter for both people and wildlife and needs to be referred to in appropriate policies. This will also need to be taken into account in any detailed design and masterplanning. However it is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch into the heart of Cambridge to be crossed by roads. indeed Barnwell Road already crosses the existing Green Corridor. Th important characteristic of Green Corridors is that they are broad swathes of open countryside reachiong into Cambridge that are not interrupted by built development.	Note need to ensure appropriate connectivity in the AAP policies on recreation, landscape and biodiversity and in future more detailed planning stages.
3964 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature broadly supports the preferred approach that this policy takes but in particular it welcomes the following bullet points: point 2 which deals with the connection of green spaces through to the countryside. point 7 which aims to achieve a net increase in biodiversity across the site point 9 regarding the use of green spaces and water features to contribute to biodiversity. These principles are in line with the advice set out in draft PPS9 regarding networks of natural habitats. If networks of habitats and green spaces can be identified and linked together, as suggested in these development principles, they can provide a valuable resource of biodiversity and provide stepping stones for the migration of plants and animals	Support noted.	
3107	Support	Sports centre needed for Abbey residents. Improved facilities for existing Abbey ward children of all ages, especially teenagers, for pensioners and for other residents.	Comment noted. This is the type of facility referred to in the 3rd bullet point which suggests that facilities can help serve the existing as well as the new community.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2829 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the proposed green corridor and country park and measures aimed at enhancing biodiversity.	Support noted.	
3806 - English Heritage	Support	Add an additional bullet 'reflect, and be sensitive to, the evolution of the landscape, by reference to the Historic Landscape Characterisation database'.	This is too detailed a point for the Development Principles and it is considered that this heavily managed airport site has very little historic landscape character remaining. However, it is agreed that the landscaping of the development should respect the local landscape character and the the 3rd bullet point in CE50 should be amended to reflect this.	In any policy derived from CE50, Preferred Approach to landscape, amend the 3rd bullet point to read: - ensure that any alterations to topography AND ANY LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS are appropriate to local landscape character.
4273 - Sport England	Support	With reference to para 12.6: Sport England supports the principle of proposal to locate formal sports pitches in a cluster adjacent to the secondary school with appropriate ancillary facilities, as this will provide greater flexibility of use by the school and community.	Support noted.	
4474 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the development principles for Cambridge East. We would request consideration of the following amendments; - Rewording of second bullet point to read -Connect the green spaces of Cambridge to the countryside beyond the new urban quarter with a green corridor that links to Coldhams Common and also to a new country park. - An addition to development principles referring to the maximisation of energy conservation and renewable energy provision.	It is considered that this is a matter which should apply to all developments and is not therefore site specific to the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5186 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support CE2, particularly because it proposes "a green corridor linking through to Coldhams Common and a new Country Park", restoring the route between Coldhams Common and Teversham that was formerly footpath 109 in Cambridge City. This will recreate a link to the wider path network east of Cambridge, which was lost in 1975 when the path across the airfield was closed.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE2 Cambridge East Development Principles - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach with the following changes:

- amend 2nd bullet to read "Connect the green spaces of Cambridge through to the countryside with a green corridor linking through to Coldhams Common LINKING TO a new country park, TO THE EAST OF AIRPORT WAY AND SOUTH OF NEWMARKET ROAD, AND THE NATIONAL TRUST'S WICKEN FEN VISION."

- add new bullet - "provide an appropriate level of commercial and community facilities to meet the needs of its residents"

- add new bullet - "define the boundaries of the Green Belt to retain as Green Belt that land which is required to maintain the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt"

NOTE: need to ensure appropriate connectivity in the AAP policies on recreation, landscape and biodiversity and in future more detailed planning stages.

CE50: Landscape - amend 3rd bullet to read - "ensure that any alterations to topography AND ANY LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS are appropriate to local landscape character."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE3 The Cambridge East Site - Preferred Option</i>				
1567	Object	It is utterly inappropriate for this site to be made available to housing when there is no official plan or consideration as to where the current occupiers of the site, Marshalls Aerospace, will move to. This move may involve the construction of an airport with all the consequent planning, environmental, economic and a host of other concerns. Before this matter is decided the new site for the Marshalls aerospace airport should be decided.	The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. There are separate processes under way for the relocation of the Airport. The main purpose of this first version of the AAP is to bring forward a first phase of development on land north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. An early review of the AAP is proposed once the relocation of the Airport is further advanced.	
1804 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall Objects to CE3 and urges support for CE4. In terms of an urban extension a clear and obvious boundary is necessary. The extra land to be included in CE4 is not so remote from Cambridge as to be rejected from its over-stretching urban form. Clearly any built development in this area would require careful consideration of any built form and its relation to the countryside. Similar thought must be given to landscaping to provide a setting for such a new development and enhance the setting of Cambridge.	Option CE4 is rejected because it includes land which could potentially extend the development in this area significantly to the east, such that the development north of Newmarket Road would not have a logical physical relationship with the extent of development on the Airport site. The issue of following clear boundaries for the site is a relevant consideration but does not outweigh the inappropriateness of the area for development. It is proposed that CE3 provides an appropriate boundary for the site but in view of the proposal to identify the land to be released from the Green Belt in this version of the AAP (CE9-CE11), it is proposed that the site boundary be consistent with the Green Belt boundary. It is therefore proposed that the eastern boundary of the site north of Newmarket Road follow the ditch/hedge line running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road, to the west of Airport Way roundabout, consistent with the proposed boundary for the Green Belt. Other consequential changes to the site boundary are to exclude the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common and to exclude existing housing south of Newmarket Road.	The site identified in CE3 be pursued in the AAP but amended to: - revise the eastern boundary of the site north of Newmarket Road to follow the ditch/hedge line running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road, to the west of Airport Way roundabout, consistent with the proposed boundary for the Green Belt - exclude the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common and - to exclude existing housing south of Newmarket Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2928	Object	This site cannot be accepted until a new location for Marshalls is agreed, and the impact of their move to the new location considered. The plan is incomplete without this: this may have considerable negative impact on the new location which must be balanced against the positive impacts the plan has on the East Cambridge area. We understand that Duxford is considered as the preferred option; this would have an extremely damaging impact on that local area.	The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. There are separate processes under way for the relocation of the Airport. The main purpose of this first version of the AAP is to bring forward a first phase of development on land north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. An early review of the AAP is proposed once the relocation of the Airport is further advanced. With regard to Duxford, Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities.	
2922 2369 2367 1116	Object	The development as proposed is too large in proportion to the size of the city. Key planning principles have been ignored and assumptions are flawed.	The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. The Structure Plan also sets a housing requirement on the City and District Councils which establishes the general scale of development at Cambridge East. The principle of this development was considered in detail at the Structure Plan Examination in Public and is therefore now accepted. It is for the Area Action Plan to set more detailed policies for this development within that strategic policy framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3278 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd	Object	<p>The policy is un-robust as it places the implementation of a major policy in the Development Plan dependent upon the investment and business decisions of a private company.</p> <p>No appropriate site exists for the removal of Marshall's Airfield which will not cause immense environmental harm and serious harm to the amenities of residents.</p> <p>An alternative site exists outside the Green Belt at Six Mile Bottom in a sustainable location linked by an existing rail route to Cambridge which it is proposed to upgrade to light rail LRT and which has excellent links to the national road network.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. The principle of this development was considered in detail at the Structure Plan Examination in Public, alongside other strategic scale proposals including Six Miles Bottom, and is therefore now accepted. There are separate processes under way for the relocation of the Airport and there is no reason to assume it will not come forward.</p>	
2376 2395	Object	<p>The issue of safety so close to an airport also seems to have been ignored. We are aware of designated no-build zones along the runway approach corridor, but any increase in densely populated housing nearby increases the consequential risk of accident.</p>	<p>The issue of safety is an important consideration for any phase of development that comes forward with the Airport in place. The proposed development of a first phase north of Newmarket Road has full regard to safety. The runway safety zones do not preclude development on this first phase. There are restrictions on building heights on the area close to Newmarket Road, but as these mean that building height must not exceed 4 storeys, this will not preclude a suitable form, mass and scale of development, and will not compromise safety.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2378 2381	Object	No consideration ought to be given to any development on the scale suggested until detailed and well-worked plans to relieve the current congestion problems are not just published, but are visibly working.	The AAP will include transport proposals to serve the development. In this version of the AAP, they will focus in detail on the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, in the context of development proposals for the overall development. It is not reasonable in planning terms to require development to address existing problems. However, the County Council is undertaking a study into the transport issues for the wider Cambridge area which will lead to the development of a strategy. Where it is reasonable, contributions will be sought from developments in and on the edge of Cambridge to implement necessary measures. These would be set out as policy requirements in the next version of the AAP. Other measures will be the responsibility of the County Council as highway authority.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3760	Object	The northern site boundary should not extend as far as the tree belt or old railway line and High Ditch Road. In previous discussions with Simon Kime and, I believe a paper was submitted or 3 or 5 years ago, the site area was bounded by the old 'Hangar 19' boundaries this left a reasonable field width either side of the old railway and high ditch road thus preserving this green corridor, not compromising the setting of the village and allowing the new housing to be an organic development of the Fison Road area. I note this will reduce the potential number of housing units but it will still lead to a significant contribution to the overall targets.	The Preferred Options report is the first occasion where the Councils have produced and consulted on possible boundaries for this development. It is considered that the disused railway provides a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt that provides a logical extension of the boundary to the west which also follows the railway adjoining the Fisons estate. In terms of an appropriate area for development, it is considered that the area to the south of the tree belt can be developed without harming the character or setting of Fen Ditton and that this will be an organic development from the Fison Road area. The tree belt is a crucial part of providing necessary physical and visual separation from the village and will be included in an area of green separation where there will be additional controls on uses within that area. However, the tree belt should also be included in the site for Phase 1 of development so that its retention as strategic landscaping can be ensured and also its enhancement, such as supplemental planting on the southern side of the tree belt to vary its width to create a more interesting natural form, and selective additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominantly native species. The former Hanger 19 proposal is not relevant to this development	
4870 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Para 2.5 of the options report advises that it will be for the AAP to define specific boundaries and these key issues can be considered properly when the AAP is reviewed. In view of the significant impact that this proposal could have on coalescence of Cambridge and existing settlements and the clear objectives of Structure Plan policy P9/2a, the boundaries of the proposed development, in particular phase 1 Newmarket Road, must be considered now rather than left for later approval.	In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundaries in this AAP and to carry out a further minor review if necessary in the review of the AAP, it is now possible to define the site boundaries of both the site as a whole and Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road in this AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4471 - LDA Design (Land East of Fen Ditton and proposed Footpath)	Object	Land between A14 and High Ditch Road should be removed from green belt to allow limited development south of A14 in associate with delivery of aspects of Landscapes East concept both north and south of A14. Approach supports preferred option CS9.	There is no strategic context for removing land north of High Ditch Road from the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, it is considered that this area performs an important Green Belt function in restricting the outward expansion of the City, protecting against coalescence with the necklace villages and contributing to the setting of Cambridge. The Landscapes East concept is understood to be about countryside access and links to the Wicken Fen vision to the north, not development. The principle of the Cambridge East development linking into the Bridge of Reeds and wider countryside access to the north is consistent with the Preferred Options report, but inappropriate development in the Green Belt is not.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5522 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council consider that the proposed building area has expanded considerably. Far beyond any scheme that has been discussed in the past.	The Preferred Options report is the first occasion where the Councils have produced and consulted on possible boundaries for this development. It is considered that the disused railway provides a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt that provides a logical extension of the boundary to the west which also follows the railway adjoining the Fisons estate. In terms of an appropriate area for development, it is considered that the area to the south of the tree belt can be developed without harming the character or setting of Fen Ditton and that this will be an organic development from the Fison Road area. The tree belt is a crucial part of providing necessary physical and visual separation from the village and will be included in an area of green separation where there will be additional controls on uses within that area. However, the tree belt should also be included in the site for Phase 1 of development so that its retention as strategic landscaping can be ensured and also its enhancement, such as supplemental planting on the southern side of the tree belt to vary its width to create a more interesting natural form, and selective additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominantly native species. This issue was considered at the Stakeholder Workshop and there was general agreement in the working group looking at this issue that this was an appropriate way forward. The Parish Council was represented in those discussions.	
2385	Object	Employers should support housing needs - self-fulfilling growth.	The district wide proposals in the Core Strategy will require employment development to make contributions to affordable housing where it is likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire or the Cambridge Sub-Region.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6639 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	The 220yard separation distance between the edge of Marshall's development and Teversham is inadequate. A minimum of 880yards should apply to preserve the 'village' character of Teversham.	The Preferred Options report did not suggest any specific extent of separation between the development and Teversham. Consideration is now being given to this as part of the proposal to define the Green Belt boundaries in this version of the AAP which will include defining the boundaries of the Green Corridor between Teversham and Coldhams Common and the physical extent of green separation with Teversham. This is addressed at CE64 and proposes a minimum of 200m between the development and any part of Teversham village.	
1624 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 1779	Support	Support the preferred option. The site should not extend any further into the countryside.	Support noted.	
1780	Support	Prefer this option to the rejected options. 1) Meadowlands has always been a cul-de-sac and must be retained as a cul-de-sac to retain character. 2) Fallback should also be worked on in case Marshall's don't move. 3) The "options" in this report, are too limited.	Support noted. The AAP will not proposed that there should be any access to the site via Meadowlands. There are separate processes under way for the relocation of the Airport and there is no reason to assume it will not come forward. The main purpose of this first version of the AAP is to bring forward a first phase of development on land north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. An early review of the AAP is proposed once the relocation of the Airport is further advanced. The Preferred Options report focuses on key issues for the development of Cambridge East. If the Councils considered that there is a particular preferred approach on an issue on technical grounds, the report is clear about this. It only includes options where there is a genuine choice to be made or to demonstrate where an alternative option has been rejected and why. This ensures that public participation is focused on key issues where choices need to be made.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2770	Support	I strongly support the eventual reuse of the airport site for housing. Aircraft landing at Marshalls fly very low over where I live and I would be very glad to see the end of this.	Support noted.	
4475 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3721 - GO-East 4467 - RLW Estates	Support	Support the preferred option for the Cambridge East site boundary. This boundary provides a logical relationship between the two parts of Cambridge East development north and south of Newmarket Road and will ensure that the development relates more effectively to the urban area of Cambridge.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE3 The Cambridge East Site - Preferred Option

Pursue Preferred Option but amend to: - revise the eastern boundary of the site north of Newmarket Road to follow the ditch/hedge line running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road, to the west of Airport Way roundabout, consistent with the proposed boundary for the Green Belt - exclude the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common and - to exclude existing housing south of Newmarket Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE4 The Cambridge East Site - Rejected Option</i>				
2396 2375	Object	The issue of safety so close to an airport also seems to have been ignored. We are aware of designated no-build zones along the runway approach corridor, but any increase in densely populated housing nearby increases the consequential risk of accident.	The issue of safety is an important consideration for any phase of development that comes forward with the Airport in place. The proposed development of a first phase north of Newmarket Road has full regard to safety. The runway safety zones do not preclude development on this first phase. There are restrictions on building heights on the area close to Newmarket Road, but as these mean that building height must not exceed 4 storeys, this will not preclude a suitable form, mass and scale of development, and will not compromise safety.	
5685 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall Objects to CE3 and urges support for CE4. In terms of an urban extension a clear and obvious boundary is necessary. The extra land to be included in CE4 is not so remote from Cambridge as to be rejected from its over-stretching urban form. Clearly any built development in this area would require careful consideration of any built form and its relation to the countryside. Similar thought must be given to landscaping to provide a setting for such a new development and enhance the setting of Cambridge.	Option CE4 is rejected because it includes land which could potentially extend the development in this area significantly to the east, such that the development north of Newmarket Road would not have a logical physical relationship with the extent of development on the Airport site. The issue of following clear boundaries for the site is a relevant consideration but does not outweigh the inappropriateness of the area for development. It is proposed that CE3 provides an appropriate boundary for the site but in view of the proposal to identify the land to be released from the Green Belt in this version of the AAP (CE9-CE11), it is proposed that the site boundary be amended to be consistent with the Green Belt boundary.	
1239	Support	I support the rejection of this Option. I live at Quy Waters and do not wish to have an outlook on a housing estate from my back garden. The Newmarket Road at Quy Waters could not be widened and I have already endured the inconvenience of a cycle path being made too close to my property which restricts access by car.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4472 - LDA Design (Land East of Fen Ditton and proposed Footpath)	Support	Land between A14 and High Ditch Road should be removed from green belt to allow limited development south of A14 in associate with delivery of aspects of Landscapes East concept both north and south of A14. Approach supports preferred option CS9.	There is no strategic context for removing land north of High Ditch Road from the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, it is considered that this area performs an important Green Belt function in restricting the outward expansion of the City, protecting against coalescence with the necklace villages and contributing to the setting of Cambridge. The Landscapes East concept is understood to be about countryside access and links to the Wicken Fen vision to the north, not development. The principle of the Cambridge East development linking into the Bridge of Reeds and wider countryside access to the north is consistent with the Preferred Options report, but inappropriate development in the Green Belt is not.	
4476 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The rejection of this option is supported, as it would extend the development significantly to the east, which would fail to relate to the development south of Newmarket Road.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE4 The Cambridge East Site - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE5 The North of Newmarket Road Site - Preferred Approach</i>				
1126	Object	The North Works site should include the Marshalls garage frontage to encourage a socially inclusive mix of inhabitants.	The site for North Works is proposed to include the North Works within it to ensure a holistic approach to the planning of this first phase of development. The issue of whether the car showrooms should be redeveloped or integrated into the development in a different way is addressed at CE6 under a separate representation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1355	Object	I object to the plan extending as far north as the High Ditch Road. It is important to ensure a substantial, clear, visible corridor between the new Cambridge development and the village of Fen Ditton. In addition to the aesthetic and social merits of preserving the green belt around Fen Ditton, there are strong historical reasons: High Ditch Road follows the route of the ancient Fleam Dyke, and the proposed plan threatens the character of this site.	The Structure Plan requires that in reviewing the Green Belt boundaries to bring forward the strategic developments, local authorities "provide green separation between existing settlements and any urban expansion of Cambridge to maintain the identity of the individual settlements" (Policy P9/2b). It is considered that the existing tree belt and land to the north of it provides physical and visual separation which achieves this objective. The disused railway provides a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt that provides a logical extension of the boundary to the west which also follows the railway adjoining the Fisons estate. In terms of an appropriate area for development, it is considered that the area to the south of the tree belt can be developed without harming the character or setting of Fen Ditton and that this will be an organic development from the Fison Road area. The tree belt is a crucial part of providing necessary physical and visual separation from the village and will be included in an area of green separation where there will be additional controls on uses within that area. However, the tree belt should also be included in the site for Phase 1 of development so that its retention as strategic landscaping can be ensured and also its enhancement, such as supplemental planting on the southern side of the tree belt to vary its width to create a more interesting natural form, and selective additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominantly native species. No development is proposed to the north of High Ditch Road and with the retention of the tree belt, will be some way to the south of the road itself.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2373 2397	Object	The issue of safety so close to an airport also seems to have been ignored. We are aware of designated no-build zones along the runway approach corridor, but any increase in densely populated housing nearby increases the consequential risk of accident.	The issue of safety is an important consideration for any phase of development that comes forward with the Airport in place. The proposed development of a first phase north of Newmarket Road has full regard to safety. The runway safety zones do not preclude development on this first phase. There are restrictions on building heights on the area close to Newmarket Road, but as these mean that building height must not exceed 4 storeys, this will not preclude a suitable form, mass and scale of development, and will not compromise safety.	
3761	Object	Case as above but please note the tree belt is no more than 20 years old and shows that a defining boundary can be developed quite quickly along the site boundary previously described.	It is recognised that the tree belt is relatively recently established. In terms of defining the Green Belt boundary, it is proposed that the disused railway line provides a clear and appropriate physical feature on the ground. The site boundary is proposed to include the tree belt. However, it is recognised that the tree belt provides a valuable feature which provides immediate strategic landscaping for the development and also helps to achieve physical and visual separation from the proposed development and the village of Fen Ditton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5527 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	It is very important that the green corridor is maintained. Significantly the cycle path from Thorpe Way to the park & ride should be protected. The Parish Council consider that it is important that this path does not become a back alley and that 30-30 foot of grass either side of the path should be preserved.	It is considered that the disused railway provides a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt that provides a logical extension of the boundary to the west which also follows the railway adjoining the Fisons estate. In terms of an appropriate area for development, it is considered that the area to the south of the tree belt can be developed without harming the character or setting of Fen Ditton and that this will be an organic development from the Fison Road area. The tree belt is a crucial part of providing necessary physical and visual separation from the village and will be included in an area of green separation where there will be additional controls on uses within that area. However, the tree belt should also be included in the site for Phase 1 of development so that its retention as strategic landscaping can be ensured and also its enhancement, such as supplemental planting on the southern side of the tree belt to vary its width to create a more interesting natural form, and selective additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominantly native species. This issue was considered at the Stakeholder Workshop and there was general agreement in the working group looking at this issue that the this was an appropriate way forward. The Parish Council was represented in those discussions. The retention of the Jubilee cycle path across the site from the Park & Ride site to Thorpe Way will be required by the AAP as part of a network of high quality cycleway provision.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2370	Object	Key planning principles have been ignored and assumptions are flawed. We have no objection to 100 or even 200 houses, but the impact of the sheer vastness of scale of the development has not been considered in what we believe would be a devastating over-population. Many businesses are locating outside of Cambridge and employees are not automatically drawn to live in Cambridge centre and commute outwards the Cambourne new town is the blueprint to place development away from what is already a highly densely populated centre and environs of Cambridge, which is in essence a city of education and tourism.	Regional Planning Guidance Note 6 established the overall level of growth in the Cambridge area and set a sequence for development which focuses on Cambridge in order to provide a better balance between jobs and homes close to Cambridge. The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. The Structure Plan also sets a housing requirement on the City and District Councils which establishes the general scale of development at Cambridge East. The principle of this development was considered in detail at the Structure Plan Examination in Public and is therefore now accepted. It is for the Area Action Plan to set more detailed policies for this development within that strategic policy framework.	
6405	Object	Do not develop north of Newmarket Road, the impact on Fen Ditton will destroy the village feel there, develop South of Newmarket Road only.	The Structure Plan identifies land north of Newmarket Road, along with land at Cambridge Airport and north of Cherry Hinton for a strategic scale of development. The principle of this development was considered in detail at the Structure Plan Examination in Public and is therefore now accepted. It is for the Area Action Plan to set more detailed policies for this development within that strategic policy framework. The Structure Plan requires that in reviewing the Green Belt boundaries to bring forward the strategic developments, local authorities "provide green separation between existing settlements and any urban expansion of Cambridge to maintain the identity of the individual settlements" (Policy P9/2b). It is considered that the existing tree belt and land to the north of it provides physical and visual separation which achieves this objective.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1805 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports this Preferred Approach on the basis that it is a reference to Phase 1 of development North of Newmarket Road. Land further to the east is to be excluded from the green belt, to allow development there following the relocation of Marshall Aerospace.	Support noted.	
4477 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	It should be made clear that the site boundary indicates the extent of the development including peripheral landscaping and open space on the edge of the development.	Support noted. It will be made clear in the AAP that the site includes strategic landscaping which must be retained and enhanced plus any open uses associated with the development. The existing tree belt will be included in an area of green separation to which a specific policy will apply, as well as lying within the site boundary.	
5688 - The Marshall Group	Support	The redevelopment of that part of the North Works to be vacated can commence within 3 to 5 years. House building on the adjacent agricultural land could commence sooner. Preliminary work has begun on establishing development principles to help form a strategic masterplan for Cambridge East. That work will be taken forward at a more detailed level for North of Newmarket Road, to establish a basis for early development.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE5 The North of Newmarket Road Site - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE6 North Works - Option 1 - Alternative Option</i>				
7787	Object	The North Works site should include the Marshalls garage frontage to encourage a socially inclusive mix of inhabitants.	From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall's has also given a very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelopment the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term. The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term.	Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3629 - GO-East	Object	<p>CE6 and CE7 - North Works</p> <p>We consider that Option 2 may have advantages in achieving greater integration between the two parts of the development either side of Newmarket Road. However, we take the view that any final consideration of this issue should be addressed through a design-led approach, which should examine how the most efficient use of the site can be achieved, balanced with the need to integrate the two parts of the overall development while minimising the impacts of Newmarket Road on future residents.</p>	<p>From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall's has also given a very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelopment the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term.</p> <p>The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms.</p> <p>If this approach is pursued, it is particularly important that the area between the car showrooms and the Park & Ride site is made best use of to ensure that a prominent and high quality built frontage is achieved to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms This includes the employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site (see CE8). The frontage should include residential uses, eg. apartments and town houses, to create a residential presence at the entrance to the new neighbourhood. The proximity to the engine testing bay is an issue for residential amenity and this will</p>	<p>Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			<p>need to be addressed in association with the development, whether this be by relocation or other measures.</p> <p>It will be important to improve the urban character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.</p>	
1631 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge	Support	<p>Because of the uncertain future about the development of the airport site this site north of Newmarket road needs to developed almost in isolation. The car showrooms provide employment and should therefore be retained.</p> <p>Also the busy Newmarket Road is hardly going to add much to the environment for the new housing so as much of it should be towards the back of the site as possible with non traffic links into the Fisons Estate.</p>	Support noted. Issues surrounding the car showrooms and non-car links with the Fisons Estate are dealt with under separate options.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1806 - The Marshall Group	Support	Proposals for the redevelopment of the North Works are critically dependent on the retention of the car showrooms fronting Newmarket Road, together with sufficient land to enable them to function properly. The retention of those car showrooms will not harm the quality of the new housing areas.	<p>Support for this option noted, as well as Marshall's very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelopment the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term.</p> <p>The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms.</p> <p>If this approach is pursued, it is particularly important that the area between the car showrooms and the Park & Ride site is made best use of to ensure that a prominent and high quality built frontage is achieved to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms. This includes the employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site (see CE8). The frontage should include residential uses, eg. apartments and town houses, to create a residential presence at the entrance to the new neighbourhood. The proximity to the engine testing bay is an issue for residential amenity and</p>	Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>this will need to be addressed in association with the development, whether this be by relocation or other measures.</p>	
		<p>It will be important to improve the urban character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4049 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6030 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 4469 - RLW Estates 4528 2054 3762	Support	Support Option 1 which excludes the car showrooms from the Marshall's North Works site, as a more realistic approach. The car showrooms are an interesting feature and should be retained.	<p>From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall's has also given a very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelop the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term.</p> <p>The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms.</p> <p>It will be important to improve the urban character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road.</p>	Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.

Decision on CE6 North Works - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE7 North Works - Option 2 - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1807 - The Marshall Group	Object	The car showrooms are the heart of the Marshall Motor Group operation in Cambridge. Marshall will not promote a scheme requiring their demolition. Appropriate quality in the adjacent housing can be achieved without the necessity of demolition.	Marshall's very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms is noted. From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelop the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term. The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms. If this approach is pursued, it is particularly important that the area between the car showrooms and the Park & Ride site is made best use of to ensure that a prominent and high quality built frontage is achieved to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms This includes the employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site (see CE8). The frontage should include residential uses, eg. apartments and town houses, to create a residential presence at the entrance to the new neighbourhood. The proximity to the engine testing bay is an issue for residential amenity and this will need to be addressed in association with the development, whether this be by relocation or other measures. It will be important to improve the urban	Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3630 - GO-East	Support	<p>CE6 and CE7 - North Works</p> <p>We consider that Option 2 may have advantages in achieving greater integration between the two parts of the development either side of Newmarket Road. However, we take the view that any final consideration of this issue should be addressed through a design-led approach, which should examine how the most efficient use of the site can be achieved, balanced with the need to integrate the two parts of the overall development while minimising the impacts of Newmarket Road on future residents.</p>	<p>From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall's has also given a very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelopment the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term. The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms. If this approach is pursued, it is particularly important that the area between the car showrooms and the Park & Ride site is made best use of to ensure that a prominent and high quality built frontage is achieved to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms This includes the employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site (see CE8). The frontage should include residential uses, eg. apartments and town houses, to create a residential presence at the entrance to the new neighbourhood. The proximity to the engine testing bay is an issue for residential amenity and this will need to be addressed in association with the development, whether this be by relocation or other measures. It will be important to improve the urban</p>	<p>Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4050 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council could support either of these options as detailed in Paragraph 2.9 of the AAP. On balance there is marginally more advantage to Option 2 in that it offers more scope for strategic master planning and could relate better with development south of Newmarket Road.	From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall's has also given a very clear statement that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelop the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term. The Cambridge East development is a long term development which will take place over many years. The AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This could mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms. It will be important to improve the urban character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be	Pursue option CE6 in the AAP but set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.

Decision on CE7 North Works - Option 2 - Alternative Option

Do not pursue CE7, but in taking forward option CE6 in the AAP set out a clear policy aspiration for the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the longer term for a more appropriate form of development on this important frontage with a higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over ground floor car showrooms.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE8 Employment Uses Adjacent to the Park & Ride Site - Preferred Approach</i>				
1808 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall is sympathetic to the need to redevelop this site but operational requirements may determine that it cannot be achieved as part of Phase 1.	If the car showrooms are to retain in their present location and form for the foreseeable future, it is imperative that maximum use of made of the limited frontage between the showrooms and the Park & Ride site in order to provide a quality face for the new development and to integrate it into the wider development in the longer term. It is understood that the relocation of the petrol filling station may have to be in a later phase of development in order to retain the facility in the area throughout the development. The design of the Newmarket Road frontage must allow for the retention of this facility without compromising the long term quality of the built frontage. This argument does not apply to the other employment uses in this location. These uses take up a lot of land and do not lend themselves to the creation of an attractive urban frontage. In view of the proximity to the engine testing bay on the south side of Newmarket Road, it may be possible for the redevelopment of these uses to be towards the end of the implementation of Phase 1 to protect residential amenity, but it is nonetheless important that they are redeveloped as part of the completion of this first phase.	CE8 be pursued, with a requirement to retain a petrol filling station in this area at all times during the development, which may mean that it remains on its present site in the short term.
2775	Object	This petrol station is very convenient and I would oppose its removal unless equivalent facilities can be provided close to the present site. Otherwise I have no problems with CE8.	It is understood that the relocation of the petrol filling station may have to be in a later phase of development in order to retain the facility in the area throughout the development. The design of the Newmarket Road frontage must allow for the retention of this facility without compromising the long term quality of the built frontage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4051 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The retention of these uses is undesirable from a master planning perspective, and would not be compatible with the high quality urban extension. It is agreed that the petrol filling station should be relocated elsewhere within the development.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE8 Employment Uses Adjacent to the Park & Ride Site - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach, with a requirement to retain a petrol filling station in this area at all times during the development, which may mean that it remains on its present site in the short term.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3. Green Belt				
<i>CE9 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 1 - Alternative Option</i>				
2929 2136	Object	The Green Belt should be defined as early as possible, but not "refined" further.	Agree that the Green Belt should be defined as best as is possible at this stage. The possible need to refine the boundary of the Green Belt in the early review should only involve minimal changes if any and would need to be adequately justified. Where the new boundary can follow clear physical features no further changes will be proposed unless there are compelling reasons for doing so - e.g. if a new link to the A14 is provided, there may be a justification to change the boundary in this area. However, given the lack of physical features on the majority of the Airport site on which to base a new boundary, some changes in this location may be unavoidable as the masterplanning proceeds particularly in relation to the alignment of the green corridor. This would be a matter to be considered in the review of the AAP.	
3114	Object	Keep Peverel Rd allotments for allotment use, improve cultivation for would be allotment holders. Retain wildlife area Peverel Rd uncultivated allotments has become, to enhance quality of life of Peverel Rd council estate residents whose estate is bordered on one side by the busy Newmarket Rd and on another by the equally congested Barnwell Rd. Strong recent opposition from Peverel Rd residents to hangar building or any business development on this site. Petitions submitted to planning dept.	The Preferred Options Report includes no options relating to the allotments, which are in any event not part of the Cambridge Green Belt. The City Council has identified its usage as allotments as low and the site is allocated for development in the Cambridge City Redeposit Local Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5015 - Teversham Parish Council 2558 - RAVE 2391 1036 2178	Object	Object to any future green belt modifications.	The principle of Green Belt release in this location has been established by Structure Plan Policy P9/2C. The Structure Plan was informed by a Green Belt Study and was subject to public examination. The AAP must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.	
4478 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Attempting to define the green corridor at this stage would be difficult and potentially misleading if it needed to be substantially altered in the light of master planning for Cambridge East.	Disagree, GO-East make the point that sufficient work has been done to identify the boundary with sufficient confidence that only minimal changes would be needed later. A key consideration must be to give confidence to the landowner that the site will be developed; Marshall's have indicated that they would not be confident with merely a commitment to release and from Green Belt at some later stage. The principle of releasing the site from Green Belt is also indicated in the Structure Plan Policy P9/2c. However, local communities are understandably concerned to ensure that Green Belt protection is retained over key areas to maintain village character, and in particular the green corridor. The option favoured by a number of representations, CE9, including GO-East, would give confidence to both Marshall and local communities.	
5189 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	We remain committed to the protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt, and would expect this to be a prime consideration in the choice between policy options. Extensions of the Green Belt beyond its present boundaries should be considered, in compensation for any loss to development.	The Cambridge Green Belt extends significantly beyond the boundaries of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. There is no strategic justification paragraph for a compensatory extension to the Green Belt in respect of this development. The AAP cannot therefore provide for extensions and additions to the Cambridge Green Belt.	
1810 - The Marshall Group 1828 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support that an appropriate and defensible green belt boundary can be achieved.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3726 - GO-East 3379	Support	General support for the preliminary redesignation of green belt as early and as clearly as possible.	Support noted. Agree that the Green Belt should be defined as best as is possible at this stage. The possible need to refine the boundary of the Green Belt in the early review should only involve minimal changes if any and would need to be adequately justified. Where the new boundary can follow clear physical features no further changes will be proposed unless there are compelling reasons for doing so - e.g. if a new link to the A14 is provided, there may be a justification to change the boundary in this area. However, given the lack of physical features on the majority of the Airport site on which to base a new boundary, some changes in this location may be unavoidable as the masterplanning proceeds particularly in relation to the alignment of the green corridor. This would be a matter to be considered in the review of the AAP.	That the procedure set out in CE9, to define the Green Belt boundary at this stage, with the potential to refine it in a later review, be adopted as the approach in the Area Action Plan. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City.

Decision on CE9 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE9. That the procedure set out in CE9, to define the Green Belt boundary at this stage, with the potential to refine it in a later review, be adopted as the approach in the Area Action Plan. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE10 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 2 - Alternative Option</i>				
1811 - The Marshall Group 1835 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object because it is not proper to redesignate the green corridor as green belt. It falls foul of the advice given in PPG2 about the nature and functions of green belt.	It is appropriate that the Green Corridor be protected by its designation as Green Belt in order to preserve it from development and so contribute to the setting and character of Cambridge. It will be one of the characteristic green corridors running into the City all of which are protected as Green Belt and should continue to link with the Coldham's Common part of the corridor which is Green Belt. This could not be retained as an 'island' divorced from the wider Green Belt.	
3287 - David Brown Landscape Design Ltd	Object	<p>The policy is un-robust as it places the implementation of a major policy in the Development Plan dependent upon the investment and business decisions of a private company.</p> <p>No appropriate site exists for the removal of Marshall's Airfield which will not cause immense environmental harm and serious harm to the amenities of residents.</p> <p>An alternative site exists outside the Green Belt at Six Mile Bottom in a sustainable location linked by an existing rail route to Cambridge which it is proposed to upgrade to light rail LRT and which has excellent links to the national road network.</p>	<p>The principle of Green Belt release in this location has been established by Structure Plan Policy P9/2C. The Structure Plan was informed by a Green Belt Study and was subject to public examination. The AAP must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the Structure Plan Examination In Public considered the merits of alternative development sites of a major scale including Six Mile Bottom. The Panel Report concludes that it is not a suitable site for such development. The report has concerns over its access to High Quality Public Transport, its location in terms of meeting local housing needs, and its largely greenfield nature. These objections remain, the site is not a viable alternative to Cambridge Airport.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3727 - GO-East	Object	<p>CE9, 10 and 11 - Green Belt Review: Cambridge East</p> <p>We note the possible advantages and disadvantages of the three options presented. The Structure Plan provides the strategic context and justification for a review of the Green Belt in this location. As a result of the transition to the new development plans system and to ensure that the development strategy in the Structure Plan is carried forward with certainty, we favour Option 1. In accordance with this option, we consider that the submission DPD should describe the Green Belt boundary, particularly in relation to the green corridor (as set out in paragraphs 12.22 - 12.24), as clearly as possible, which should result in the need for minimal detailed changes when the AAP is reviewed and the detailed boundary can be established.</p>	<p>A key consideration must be to give confidence to the landowner that the site will be developed; Marshall's have indicated that they would not be confident with merely a commitment to release land from Green Belt at some later stage. The principle of releasing the site from Green Belt is also indicated in the Structure Plan Policy P9/2c. However, local communities are understandably concerned to ensure that Green Belt protection is retained over key areas to maintain village character. The option favoured by a number of representations, CE9, including GO-East, would give confidence to both Marshall and local communities.</p>	
2562 - RAVE 4939 2392	Object	<p>The Green Belt on the airfield site has been very important in maintaining the Green Belt in past reviews. This has not changed and we should not bow to City Council pressure, and create a dangerous precedent.</p>	<p>The principle of Green Belt release in this location has been established by Structure Plan Policy P9/2C. The Structure Plan was informed by a Green Belt Study and was subject to public examination. The AAP must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.</p>	
5190 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	<p>We remain committed to the protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt, and would expect this to be a prime consideration in the choice between policy options. Extensions of the Green Belt beyond its present boundaries should be considered, in compensation for any loss to development.</p>	<p>The Cambridge Green Belt extends significantly beyond the boundaries of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. There is no strategic justification paragraph for a compensatory extension to the Green Belt in respect of this development. The AAP cannot therefore provide for extensions and additions to the Cambridge Green Belt.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4479 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6034 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 4530 2056	Support	Continual nibbling at the Green Belt is unsettling and unsatisfactory, so the whole site must be removed with a COMMITMENT to redesignate as green belt the green corridor.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE10 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 2 - Alternative Option

D not pursue CE10, Option 2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE11 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 3 - Alternative Option</i>				
2393	Object	We were brought up on the premise that Green Belt was sacrosanct and yet all the very good reasons that such land was vested seems to be overturned on a whim and a false one at that is nothing of our heritage in this eager world too sacred not to be changed.	The principle of Green Belt release in this location has been established by Structure Plan Policy P9/2C. The Structure Plan was informed by a Green Belt Study and was subject to public examination. The AAP must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.	
4480 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3729 - GO-East 1812 - The Marshall Group 1836 - The Marshall Group	Object	Objection based on the need to be unequivocal on removing this land from the green belt.	A key consideration must be to give confidence to the landowner that the site will be developed; Marshall's have indicated that they would not be confident with merely a commitment to release land from Green Belt at some later stage. The principle of releasing the site from Green Belt is also indicated in the Structure Plan Policy P9/2c. However, local communities are understandably concerned to ensure that Green Belt protection is retained over key areas to maintain village character. The option favoured by a number of representations, CE9, including GO-East, would give confidence to both Marshall and local communities.	
4817 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Option 3 will not offer any certainty that this area will come forward before 2016. Para 3.16 of the Options Report agrees that without this certainty sufficient land will need to come forward to meet the housing requirement set out in the Structure Plan. Due to the lack of certainty in relation to option 3 and the development of the airfield as a whole it is considered that other alternative sites for development should now be considered in the context of the Cambridge Local Plan ReDeposit draft.	Agree that option 3 would not provide certainty that the land will become available for development. However the way forward would be to provide that certainty through the removal of the land to be developed from the Green Belt rather than to seek to identify alternative areas for development elsewhere. Such alternative sites have already been considered in the public examination of the Structure Plan and rejected.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5191 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	We remain committed to the protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt, and would expect this to be a prime consideration in the choice between policy options. Extensions of the Green Belt beyond its present boundaries should be considered, in compensation for any loss to development.	The Cambridge Green Belt extends beyond the boundaries of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. The AAP cannot therefore provide for extensions and additions to the Cambridge Green Belt.	
1641 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 2573 - RAVE 3497 - Cambridge Preservation Society 5084 5016	Support	General support for land at the airport site remaining in the green belt.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE11 Green Belt Review: Cambridge East - Option 3 - Alternative Option

Do not pursue CE11, Option 3.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE12 Green Belt Review: North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach</i>				
5525 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 2578 - RAVE 4821 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 6523 2394 3763 1237 1813 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object because of the following concerns: 1) Fen Ditton Village will be more open to development. 2) The Green Belt should be protected.	The procedure set out in the response to CE9, is to define the Green Belt boundary in the AAP with the potential to refine it in a later review. The approach suggested in CE12 was put forward in the context of a decision yet to be made about the way in which and when the Green Belt boundaries would be defined. It therefore proposed land that could be released from the Green Belt for Phase 1, notwithstanding any decision on the rest of the site. Given the recommendation above in response to CE9 to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it is no longer necessary to address Phase 1 in isolation.	In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it is not necessary to pursue CE12 in isolation. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City. The site boundary shown in option CE3 should form the basis of the Green Belt review, with the exception of: <input type="checkbox"/> Excluding the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common <input type="checkbox"/> Land necessary to maintaining the separation of the villages from the new urban quarter to maintain their character <input type="checkbox"/> The eastern boundary of the Green Belt north of Newmarket Road be defined to follow the hedge and ditch field boundary running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road.
4481 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5192 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 3723 - GO-East	Support	General support for the removal of this land from the Green Belt.	Support noted.	

*Representations**Nature Representation Summary**District Council's Assessment**Approach to Draft DPD*

Decision on CE12 Green Belt Review: North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it is not necessary to pursue CE12 in isolation. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City. The site boundary shown in option CE3 should form the basis of the Green Belt review, with the exception of:

- Excluding the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common
- Land necessary to maintaining the separation of the villages from the new urban quarter to maintain their character
- The eastern boundary of the Green Belt north of Newmarket Road be defined to follow the hedge and ditch field boundary running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

4. District Centre

CE13 District Centre Location - Preferred Approach

2586 - RAVE	Object	This Policy is premature because the disposition of the land available for development has yet to be determined.	The Structure Plan identifies land at Cambridge Airport, North of Newmarket Road and North of Cherry Hinton for development. The main purpose of this first version of the AAP is to bring forward the first phase of development North of Newmarket Road , which can take place before the Airport relocates. However, it is important that this AAP plans holistically for the whole of the Cambridge East Development at a broad level especially for the key uses such as the District Centre, which should be located at the heart of the new urban quarter.	
4482 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3764 1814 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the location of the district centre broadly at the geographical centre of the development in order that accessibility can be maximised for all residents.	Support Noted	

Decision on CE13 District Centre Location - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

CE14 District Centre Role and Form - Preferred Approach

4483 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3807 - English Heritage 4146 - Sport England 3765 1815 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the location, role and form of the required District Centre.	Support noted.	
--	---------	--	----------------	--

Decision on CE14 District Centre Role and Form - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

5. Local Centres

CE15 Local Centres: Employment - Preferred Approach

2962	Object	The approach takes no account of the jobs lost by the development or the types of jobs being created. Marshalls are an important employer in the area and demand different skill sets to many of the bio-medical type jobs being created in the area. A full range of job types are needed in an area. Reliance on a narrow range creates viability risks and narrows opportunities for people.	The main purpose behind the development strategy of the Structure Plan is to rectify the imbalance between jobs and homes in the Cambridge area. The Structure Plan identifies Cambridge East as a strategic employment location and it is anticipated to yield between 4-5000 jobs which will include range of job types. However, it is important to strike a balance between the provision of some employment in Cambridge East, whilst at the same time ensuring that there is not overprovision of employment such that the benefits of new housing development at Cambridge to serve existing and proposed employment are lost.	
3632 - GO-East	Object	Paragraph 5.3 - Local Centres: Cambridge East The submission DPD should provide more clarity and certainty about when a decision will be made about the number and location of local centres - presumably through a review of the Area Action Plan to provide further overall details on the development of the main Airport site. However, the need to provide details in relation to development north of Newmarket Road is more pressing and will need to be addressed more directly in the submission DPD. Paragraph 18.14 is helpful in setting out the approach to implementation, which will need to be developed further into a clear strategy for the submission DPD. This applies equally to community, recreational and other facilities referred to elsewhere in the AAP.	Agree. The intention is to provide more detail on the requirement of a local centre for north of Newmarket Road in the AAP (see CE16) and more detail for the remaining site will be provided through the review of the AAP, once the relocation of the Airport is further advanced.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4052 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 5.2 The County has not identified a need for more than one library within Cambridge East.	Noted.	
4484 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1816 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support that the local centres can act as a centre for small-scale local employment uses.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE15 Local Centres: Employment - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

CE16 Local Centre North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

3766	Object	In Phase 1 new primary school is needed but maybe supermarket siting could reflect district need if sainsbury do want to move.	There is no immediate need for a large supermarket in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road but there may be potential in the future when the remainder of the site comes forward for development. However, the local centre north of Newmarket Road should include a small foodstore similar to the Budgen foodstore on the corner of Cherry Hinton and Perne Road, and associated local shopping facilities.	
4485 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2506 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 1817 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support because it is important that the first phase north of Newmarket Road has a community focus and identity as part of the city and the new urban quarter.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE16 Local Centre North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6. Housing				
<i>CE17 Housing Density - Option 1 - Alternative Option</i>				
1578 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	Housing densiities should be considered in the context of how it will contribute to "The Cambridge Phenomenon". Will having a predominance of high density housing detract from its progression. In addition local problems such as transport and access are bound to be a concern.	The Structure Plan states that Cambridge East will be a high density development. The development strategy for the Cambridge area was developed in the context of the economic success of the Cambridge Phenomenon and supporting its continued success. High densities are not inconsistent with high quality and the new urban quarter is intended to be a modern, vibrant and distinctive area which enhances the character of the City.	
1818 - The Marshall Group	Object	PPG3 makes plain the need to achieve more efficient use of land, particularly in sustainable locations. Cambridge East has been selected as a sustainable location. To specify a density of at least 50 dwellings per hectare is too low to deliver the efficient use of land at this location.	The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. Having regard to GO-East's representation that there should not be a ceiling on density targets, this could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph".	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2611 - RAVE	Object	<p>This average density is still too high for this proposed development. In particular, there should be a density gradient to the outer boundary of the development to ensure that the transition to the rural area is progressive.</p> <p>Until the overall parameters of the new development are established the issue of density cannot be addressed properly.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. This was an issue raised at the Stakeholder Workshop and building height as well as density was a key concern. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.</p>	<p>A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2512 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge	Object	<p>It is too soon to determine the actual density this is something that will come out of the Action Plans and more detailed Master Plans.</p> <p>Although encouragement should be given for high density development to determine the actual levels at this stage could lead to poor design.</p>	<p>It is agreed that it is too soon to determine the actual average density. However, the Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density and that planned new communities will be at significantly higher densities than 40 dph. In this context it is considered necessary to include a density policy to ensure this policy requirement is met. Density should ultimately be arrived at following a design led approach, with the objective of density being as high as is appropriate in order to make most efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that a high quality new urban quarter for Cambridge is delivered. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density.</p>	<p>A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.</p>
3129	Object	<p>I think it is important that Phase 1 achieves a higher density than the existing built up area and this is consonant with the concept that it should cover a smaller area.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan identifies this location as suitable for development and the objective is to make best use of that land. Higher densities will not reduce land take in this location, although it will help to meet overall housing land requirements and was an underlying assumption in the preparation of the Structure Plan.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3627 - GO-East	Object	<p>CE17 and CE18 - Housing Density</p> <p>We note that the two options are presented on an equal basis with neither being preferred. As worded, CE17 provides greater flexibility and scope for more efficient use of land ('AT LEAST 50 dwellings per hectare'), while CE18 is more rigid and includes a ceiling on the average density ('UP TO 75 dwellings per hectare').</p> <p>We take the view that a prescriptive limit should not be built into any policy at this stage but the approach should be a design-led one, which seeks to make the most efficient and effective use of land across the development in accordance with the Structure Plan's requirement that this should be a priority for high-density development.</p>	<p>The issue that any density policy should not set an upper limit on the average density is accepted. Density should ultimately be arrived at following a design led approach, with the objective of density being as high as is appropriate in order to make most efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that a high quality new urban quarter for Cambridge is delivered.</p> <p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph".</p> <p>Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.</p>	<p>A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4053 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council is unable to express a preference as it is unclear what the implications of the alternative would be.	Comment noted. The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density and that planned new communities will be at significantly higher densities than 40 dph. In this context it is considered necessary to include a density policy to ensure this policy requirement is met. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density.	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.
5258	Object	Cramming houses in at such a high density will create a slum with high crime. To improve peoples lives they need space especially children.	The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. It is recognised that in higher density developments there is a particular need for high quality public open space and this is a key part of the overall plan for the new urban quarter, including the Green Corridor through the development, an urban park on the current Park & Ride site, other formal and informal public open space within the development and a new country park adjacent to the development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5017 - Teversham Parish Council 5088 5019 4379 2976 1647	Object	Densities on the edge of the green belt and adjacent to Teversham should be lower to blend in with the existing surroundings. A very high density on any of the site would be out of character for the area. More suitable in central London. High densities are known to create social problems and so should be resisted. Some suggest that densities should be lower at 30-35dph. One representation also argued that building to a lower density would reduce transport and other infrastructure problems.	<p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph".</p> <p>Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. This was an issue raised at the Stakeholder Workshop and building height as well as density was a key concern. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.</p> <p>In determining actual densities, and therefore total number of homes and traffic movements, regard will also need to be had to the outcome of the County Transport Study and the provision of the necessary transport infrastructure to service the site.</p>	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3768	Support	I think it is important that Phase 1 achieves a higher density than the existing built up area and this is consonant with the concept that it should cover a smaller area.	Support noted. However, the Structure Plan identifies this location as suitable for development and the objective is to make best use of that land. Higher densities will not reduce land take in this location, although it will help to meet overall housing land requirements and was an underlying assumption in the preparation of the Structure Plan.	
6035 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 4531 2242	Support	50 dwellings per hectare is better than option 2. Fen Ditton is still a rural village and too many houses would not look good. In a Rural Area the lower density must be preferable.	Support noted. It must be recognised that the Cambridge East development will be a new urban quarter to Cambridge and will not have a village character. However, it needs to ensure that the identity of existing villages is maintained.	

Decision on CE17 Housing Density - Option 1 - Alternative Option

A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

CE18 Housing Density - Option 2 - Alternative Option

1090	Object	<p>I am concerned by this development at several levels. My comments would apply to most proposed development in and around Cambridge. A reliable and effective Public transport system is not yet in place to cope with additional volumes of people traveling into Cambridge. There are current bottlenecks at every major route including Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton & Newmarket Road. Could school buses alleviate the pressure and the need for parents to drive children into school? Has it been identified who could/could not use public transport i.e. the elderly, disabled, young children, and what is being provided to cater for these needs? Have the emergency services been consulted in respect of congestion, accessibility to areas, increase of staffing resources to cope with additional population. Why does the housing have to be high density, 12,000 houses crammed in with 50% allocated to housing association will lead to ghetto areas. Cambourne facilities to support new housing were not put into place as agreed - what guarantees are there that the same won't happen here? When is development going to start? Is it dependant on Marshalls vacating? Is there a time limit of when this development needs to commence?</p>	<p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. High density is not inconsistent with high quality. The AAP is particularly focused on bringing forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, but within a framework for the wider development. The new urban quarter will need to provide services and facilities to meet the needs of its residents and the AAP will include policies to secure their timely provision at trigger points throughout the development. Transport will be a key issue to resolve for this development and this is addressed under the transport options. The relocation of Marshall's is subject to a separate ongoing process. However, Phase 1 can come forward with the Airport operational.</p>	
------	--------	--	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2618 - RAVE	Object	See comment on CE 17	<p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. This was an issue raised at the Stakeholder Workshop and building height as well as density was a key concern. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.</p>	<p>A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3628 - GO-East	Object	<p>CE17 and CE18 - Housing Density</p> <p>We note that the two options are presented on an equal basis with neither being preferred. As worded, CE17 provides greater flexibility and scope for more efficient use of land ('AT LEAST 50 dwellings per hectare'), while CE18 is more rigid and includes a ceiling on the average density ('UP TO 75 dwellings per hectare').</p> <p>We take the view that a prescriptive limit should not be built into any policy at this stage but the approach should be a design-led one, which seeks to make the most efficient and effective use of land across the development in accordance with the Structure Plan's requirement that this should be a priority for high-density development.</p>	<p>The issue that any density policy should not set an upper limit on the average density is accepted. Density should ultimately be arrived at following a design led approach, with the objective of density being as high as is appropriate in order to make most efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that a high quality new urban quarter for Cambridge is delivered. The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.</p>	<p>A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4054 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council is unable to express a preference as it is unclear what the implications of the alternative would be.	Comment noted. The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density and that planned new communities will be at significantly higher densities than 40 dph. In this context it is considered necessary to include a density policy to ensure this policy requirement is met. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density.	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.
5259	Object	Cramming houses in at such a high density will create a slum with high crime. To improve peoples lives they need space especially children.	The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. It is recognised that in higher density developments there is a particular need for high quality public open space and this is a key part of the overall plan for the new urban quarter, including the Green Corridor through the development, an urban park on the current Park & Ride site, other formal and informal public open space within the development and a new country park adjacent to the development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5018 - Teversham Parish Council 6524 5089 5020 4380 1650	Object	The proposed densities are more suited to central London. Development on the edge of the City and adjacent to the countryside, including Teversham, should be lower to blend in with the existing surroundings. A very high density on any of the site would be out of character for the area. High densities are known to create social problems and so should be resisted. One representation is concerned that the development would swamp current facilities.	The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph". Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. This was an issue raised at the Stakeholder Workshop and building height as well as density was a key concern. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities. The development will be required to provide for the services and facilities required to serve the needs of the new urban quarter.	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1819 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Option 2 on the basis that it will help achieve the efficient use of land at this sustainable location. Supported by an appropriate quality of urban design, a vibrant and pleasing place can be created.	Support noted. Having regard to GO-East's representation that there should not be a ceiling on density targets. It is considered appropriate to also set a minimum density to ensure the Structure Plan objective of a high density development is met. These objectives could both be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph" but requiring "at least 50 dph".	A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

Decision on CE18 Housing Density - Option 2 - Alternative Option

A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for "average density in the order of 75 dph", but requiring "at least 50 dph" across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE19 Housing Types - Preferred Approach</i>				
2984	Object	High proportions of apartments are not in character with the city. Such developments to date do not enhance the city in any way. Large brick blocks with token bits of communal space (grass with a few shrubs) have no character. Houses with gardens develop individuality, increase bio-diversity and create better environments for children.	The preferred approach identifies the need for the development to have a variety of dwelling types. There may be a higher proportion of apartments than in other parts of the City reflecting its high density nature, but as this is an entirely new urban quarter, there is potential for it to have its own character which is complementary with the wider City. It is recognised that in higher density developments there is a particular need for high quality public open space and this is a key part of the overall plan for the new urban quarter, including the Green Corridor through the development, an urban park on the current Park & Ride site, other formal and informal public open space within the development and a new country park adjacent to the development.	
6043 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Some reservations about apartments - usually this type of development involves additional parking problems. There is no mention of accommodation for the elderly eg: bungalows or sheltered accommodation.	The treatment of parking in high density developments is a key factor and will be taken into account in the design of the development. If there is an identified need during the course of the development for subsidised sheltered housing, this could come forward under the requirement for 50% affordable housing. The market would normally respond to any other need for such accommodation.	
1821 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the Preferred Approach, which introduces scope for imaginative developments in a wide range of built form. In particular, it welcomes that housing mix policy in the core strategy should not apply to Cambridge East.	Support noted. The decision not to apply market housing mix targets to this development is in recognition that Cambridge City has seen a significant proportion of smaller homes being brought forward by the market, unlike South Cambridgeshire. It is envisaged that Cambridge East will also achieve this without the need for targets.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2243	Support	I agree with the choice of houses but what about sheltered homes? We need homes for the elderly.	Support noted. If there is an identified need during the course of the development for subsidised sheltered housing, this could come forward under the requirement for affordable housing. The market would normally respond to any other need for such accommodation.	
4486 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	This development is an extension to Cambridge and therefore the housing mix policy contained in the Core Strategy should not apply to this urban extension. A variety of dwelling types need to be provided which should include modern apartments, town houses and other forms of high-density housing types.	Support noted. The decision not to apply market housing mix targets to this development is in recognition that Cambridge City has seen a significant proportion of smaller homes being brought forward by the market, unlike South Cambridgeshire. It is envisaged that Cambridge East will also achieve this without the need for targets	
4532	Support	I have read the Cambridge East Preferred Options Report and have attended a meeting about the plan at Teversham school. Development on such a large scale is bound to make a big impact on my village of Fen Ditton and on myself personally as I will have a few hundred homes almost on the boundary of my property. For the present however, having considered the Report I am simply listing my own preferences for the Options that will affect this area. (Supports CE19 Housing Types - Preferred Approach).	Support noted.	

Decision on CE19 Housing Types - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE20 Affordable Housing - Preferred Approach</i>				
1091	Object	I am concerned by this development at several levels. My comments would apply to most proposed development in and around Cambridge. A reliable and effective Public transport system is not yet in place to cope with additional volumes of people traveling into Cambridge. There are current bottlenecks at every major route including Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton & Newmarket Road. Could school buses alleviate the pressure and the need for parents to drive children into school? Has it been identified who could/could not use public transport i.e. the elderly, disabled, young children, and what is being provided to cater for these needs? Have the emergency services been consulted in respect of congestion, accessibility to areas, increase of staffing resources to cope with additional population. Why does the housing have to be high density, 12,000 houses crammed in with 50% allocated to housing association will lead to ghetto areas. Cambourne facilities to support new housing were not put into place as agreed - what guarantees are there that the same won't happen here? When is development going to start? Is it dependant on Marshalls vacating? Is there a time limit of when this development needs to commence?	The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. High density is not inconsistent with high quality. Affordable housing covers a variety of tenures and will include significant proportions of low cost home ownership. The affordable housing will be integrated with market housing by distributing it throughout the development in small groups and not in concentrated areas. The AAP is particularly focused on bringing forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, but within a framework for the wider development. The new urban quarter will need to provide services and facilities to meet the needs of its residents and the AAP will include policies to secure their timely provision at trigger points throughout the development. Transport will be a key issue to resolve for this development and this is addressed under the transport options. The relocation of Marshall's is subject to a separate ongoing process. However, Phase 1 can come forward with the Airport operational.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1658	Object	<p>The 50% should mean 50% of the housing footprint area, NOT of the number of dwellings - this causes the social homes to have much smaller plots.</p> <p>Intermediate social housing is of relatively little value, especially for the unskilled sector.</p> <p>There should only be a small percentage of intermediate social homes, with the vast majority being for rent.</p> <p>Social homes should be managed by local Councils, to provide local accountability. (Didn't the Labour Party say they were in favour of this on several hundred occasions?)</p>	<p>The 50% affordable housing figure relates to total number of dwellings and not footprint. This is a reasonable and accepted way of securing affordable housing. There are controls over the standard of affordable housing including space standards which are not applicable to market properties. The key to ensuring appropriate provision of affordable housing is the objective that it is indistinguishable from market housing. The tenure mix between social rented of intermediate tenures such as low cost home ownership will be determined at the time individual developments come forward in the light of needs at that time and having regard to the need to ensure balanced communities.</p> <p>It is proposed to include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East to help developers and funders plan with more confidence. It is considered that an appropriate indicative tenure mix would be that of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations. This has regard to the high level of need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and the need to create balanced communities. However, the actual tenure mix will be determined each time an individual application comes forward in the light of the needs and other considerations relevant at that time.</p> <p>A study is about to be commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons in conjunction with the City and District Councils and the Cambridge Landowners Group entitled "Good Practice in Planning for and Delivering Mixed, Balanced and</p>	<p>The AAP will include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East in the supporting text. Of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			Socially Inclusive Communities within Major Proposed Developments in the Cambridge Sub Region". It is hoped that initial findings will be available before the draft Area Action Plan is finalised in May, although the study will have a particular role in the masterplanning and planning application stages. It will also inform the public examination of the AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1824 - The Marshall Group	Object	<p>Marshall objects to a requirement of 50% affordable housing. There is uncertainty of funding, both in terms of quantity and in relation to a long period of years. Both will provoke an inability to achieve an orderly sequence of development mixing affordable and open market housing.</p> <p>Communities with such a high proportion of affordable housing on this scale, have not been achieved in Cambridgeshire for many years. There are several examples of estates built some years ago, which have achieved notoriety because of social problems.</p>	<p>The proposed 50% affordable housing target is consistent with the high level of housing need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and with the Structure Plan requirement for at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub Region to be affordable, which will require a higher provision on larger sites at the heart of the Sub Region. The AAP will make clear the wide scope of the definition of affordable housing and that it includes provision for key workers. This wide definition is intended to ensure that developments meet the needs of the whole community, including those who are on average salaries but currently priced out of the local housing market by providing intermediate housing alongside social rented housing.</p> <p>It is proposed to include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East to help developers and funders plan with more confidence. It is considered that an appropriate indicative tenure mix would be that of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations. This has regard to the high level of need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and the need to create balanced communities. However, the actual tenure mix will be determined each time an individual application comes forward in the light of the needs and other considerations relevant at that time.</p> <p>A study is about to be commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons in conjunction with the City and District Councils and the Cambridge Landowners Group entitled "Good Practice in</p>	<p>The AAP will include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East in the supporting text. Of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			Planning for and Delivering Mixed, Balanced and Socially Inclusive Communities within Major Proposed Developments in the Cambridge Sub Region". It is hoped that initial findings will be available before the draft Area Action Plan is finalised in May, although the study will have a particular role in the masterplanning and planning application stages. It will also inform the public examination of the AAP.	
2773 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The commentary on low cost housing makes reference to the fact this category 'can include key workers'. The local Councils and others have carried out research and have evidence that shows that the lack of key worker housing is a serious problem in Cambridge and the surrounding area. The Trust objects to the weak reference to the need for key worker housing in this section of the options report.	The AAP will make clear that housing for key workers is included in the definition of affordable housing and that provision of suitable amounts and types of accommodation would be determined at the time of individual phases of development coming forward in the light of needs at that time.	
2382	Object	Concerned about the provision of affordable housing, but believe that the premise upon which the predicted numbers is flawed and to an extent self-fulfilling.	The Housing Needs Surveys undertaken by both Councils in 2002 followed the government's best practice methodology and identified high levels of need in both the City and South Cambridgeshire. There is also a high backlog of need because provision of affordable housing in the past has been lower than need. Affordable housing includes a wide variety of types of subsidised housing to meet the needs of those who cannot afford to access the housing market, whether they need social rented housing or low cost market housing such as shared equity because their salaries, which may be around the County average, is insufficient to purchase on the open market.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3719 - GO-East	Object	As a joint Area Action Plan between two authorities covering the whole Cambridge East site, the AAP should be self-contained and therefore include the affordable housing requirements to be applied to the site.	It is agreed that the AAP should have its own affordable housing policy and target. The approach in the City Local Plan and evolving South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document are very compatible and it is not foreseen that this would cause any drafting problems. Both Councils are seeking 50% affordable housing both district wide and in major new developments. This is consistent with the high level of housing need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and with the Structure Plan requirement for at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub Region to be affordable, which will require a higher provision on larger sites at the heart of the Sub Region.	
2515 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge	Support	Fully supports the target of 50% affordable housing. Because of the mainly greenfield nature of the east of Cambridge Site there should be no infrastructure or site clearance costs that should reduce the 50% target. There should also be a good mix of house types both for the affordable (rent and intermediate) and market housing.	Support noted. Whilst the Airport site as a whole and also the North Works site are both categorised as previously developed land, the point about land contamination is noted.	
4487 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council would expect to see 40% or more of housing being affordable including provision for key workers.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4536	Support	I have read the Cambridge East Preferred Options Report and have attended a meeting about the plan at Teversham school. Development on such a large scale is bound to make a big impact on my village of Fen Ditton and on myself personally as I will have a few hundred homes almost on the boundary of my property. For the present however, having considered the Report I am simply listing my own preferences for the Options that will affect this area. (Supports CE20 Affordable Housing - Preferred Approach).	Support noted.	

Decision on CE20 Affordable Housing - Preferred Approach

Pursue the Preferred Approach. Include an indicative tenure mix in the AAP in the supporting text. Of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7. Employment				
<i>CE21 Employment - Preferred Approach</i>				
1583 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	The provision of an adequate level of employment land allocation is considered vital to the continued progress and development of Cambridge East and to contribute to "The Cambridge Phenomenon" and the predominance of housing would does not contribute to this.	There is a current imbalance bwteen the number of jobs in Cambridge and the number of economically active residents, with the former being almost twice as high as the later. The Structure Plan policy is to accommodate economic growth whilst restoring the balance between jobs and housing to address this problem. The housing predominance at Cambridge East will help to achieve this better balance whilst also providing for between 4,000 to 5,000 jobs on-site.	
1725	Object	Further to item 7.8, no consideration is shown concerning the movement of employees at Marshalls from their current location to the new location, wherever that maybe. Thousands of extra car journeys per working day can be expected, clogging the M11 and junction 10 which is already a problem in peak times.	The relocation of parts of the Marshall Group of companies to a new site will take into account the travel to work issues of employees, both in terms of staff retention and the capacity of existing infrastructure. The relocation site has not yet been decided and it should not be assumed that the M11 and Junction 10 will be affected.	
2628 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA would wish to see this policy recognise and address the contribution that Cambridge, including this significant site reinforces its pre-eminent global leadership role in science and technology research and development by enabling and facilitating cluster expansion, particularly that associated with world renowned research institutes and encourage complementary economic linkages with other sub-regions to reinforce Cambridge's national and international functions and status.	Agree, insofar as this is consistent with the Structure Plan approach of the selective management of the economy, the promotion of clusters and by encouraging the continued expansion of high technology and knowledge based industry.	The approach to employment policy in the AAP will be consistent with that in the Structure Plan.
1842 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the Preferred Approach.	Support noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4488 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2518 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 3770	Support	General support for a housing led development to try and rectify the current mis-match.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE21 Employment - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach to employment policy in the AAP, and be consistent with that in the Structure Plan.

CE22 Employment Provision - Option 1 - Alternative Option

2632 - East of England Development Agency	Object	In the light of no evidence to the contrary, an allocation of 25 hectares at Cambridge East should be made as compared to the current Cambridge City allocation of 10 hectares. The Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England seeks to ensure that high quality business land is provided to meet the current and future needs of businesses. Policy CE22 would seem to conflict with paragraph 7.6 of the options report and CE15 which is limiting employment development to small scale local employment uses.	The Structure Plan identifies Cambridge Airport as being suitable for high-density development. The provision of a large business park built at their usual low densities would not be appropriate in what is to become a high density, mixed-use urban quarter. The same amount of employment expressed as a 'jobs requirement' is more appropriate in the context of this development.	
4055 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2314 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object because employment provision should be expressed as jobs rather than a land provision.	Agree, in a high density mixed-use urban quarter it may not be appropriate to allocate a large single site for development as a business park which such an alternative policy would tend to encourage. Expressing the employment provision as a jobs requirement is more appropriate in the context of this development.	

Decision on CE22 Employment Provision - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Option 1 not to be pursued.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE23 Employment Provision - Option 2 - Alternative Option</i>				
4056 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2315 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for gross jobs required as between 4,000 and 5,000 jobs.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE23 Employment Provision - Option 2 - Alternative Option				
Pursue option CE23.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

1660	Object	Buildings to meet perceived "Faith needs" should NOT be met from the public purse - they should only be provided commercially by "Faith" groups.	The over arching principle for the funding of the services, facilities and infrastructure that will be needed at Cambridge East is that they will be funded in full by the development.	
2041 - Cambridge Community Church Trust	Object	There should be clear recognition in this policy of the role of voluntary bodies like faith groups in helping provide some community services. Co-location and joint provision should be flexible enough to include the requirements of such groups who are able to partner with publicly funded providers. This is in line with Government policy.	Option CE24 does not rule out co-location and joint provision with voluntary bodies, although agree that the AAP should recognise the role of voluntary bodies like faith groups in helping to provide community services.	The AAP should recognise the role voluntary bodies could play in helping to provide community services.
4266 - Sport England	Object	With reference to para 8.23: Sport England supports the requirement for the provision of Community Development Workers to help establish a vibrant and sustainable community from the outset of development. However, the paragraph is objected to because it should specifically refer to the need for the team of community development workers to include a sports development officer. Such an officer would be involved in co-ordinating initiatives such as preparing community sports development strategies, establishing new community sports clubs, developing school/club links, maximising the community use of school/private sports facilities, sports coaching/training schemes etc. Paragraph 8.23 should be worded to reflect this.	This is too specific for the AAP.	

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3626 - GO-East	Object	<p>As with our representation on local centres, the submission DPD should indicate when more certainty will be provided about the amount and types of these facilities which will be required (again, through a review of the AAP?).</p> <p>It will also be necessary to show in the submission DPD more detail as to what will be required in the first phase of development, north of Newmarket Road.</p>	<p>Agree. The intention is to provide more detail regarding the community services and facilities required for north of Newmarket Road in the AAP and more detail for the remaining site will be provided through the review of the AAP, once the relocation of the Airport is further advanced.</p>	<p>Include requirements for Phase 1 of north of Newmarket Road in AAP.</p>
3693 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>It is not the role or responsibility of developers to provide a range of facilities and services on a wish list of people who will live outside of the development. Such a requirement falls outside of Circular 1/97.</p>	<p>The over-arching principle for the funding of services, facilities and infrastructure that will be needed at Cambridge East is that they will be funded in full by the development without which they would not be needed. However, the Cambridge East development is part of an overall development strategy for the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region. Strategic services, facilities and infrastructure which will be provided elsewhere in the Sub-Region may nevertheless be a requirement of the development at Cambridge East. In order to ensure that sub-regional infrastructure is provided when it is needed, that appropriate levels of funding are secured from new development and that a consistent approach is taken to securing contributions from individual development to the service, facilities and infrastructure that will be provided at each development, the planning authorities, service and infrastructure providers have established an organisation called Cambridgeshire Horizons, which is developing a planning obligation strategy which will be incorporated into the planning obligation strategy for Cambridge East.</p>	

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6526	Object	Services and facilities must be in place before the 2000 homes are built north of Newmarket Road.	The main part of the development cannot come forward until the Airport relocates and the AAP will be reviewed early to help with this. It will not be possible in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will be needed for the development of the full urban quarter at Cambridge East. However, it will include a list of the requirements of the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at that time. In addition, the AAP will also include a timetable for the provision of services, facilities and infrastructure, and will ensure that those needed at every stage of the development of Cambridge East are available.	
4489 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4131 - Sport England 2776 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 1845 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for a health campus which would be able to provide a wider range of services than would be made available for a conventional "Health Centre"	Support noted.	
6487 - Royal Mail Group	Support	<p>RMG support the approach set out in Policy CE25.</p> <p>RMG support the principle of the Cambridge East major development as set out in the Area Action Plan. However, this major development is likely to have a significant affect upon the capacity of the RMG facilities serving Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. These include a Mail Centre, Delivery Office and Local Depot.</p> <p>In this regard there is likely to be a requirement to extend these facilities to support the essential role that RMG provide in delivery postal services to all residential and commercial premises in the area. The requirement and support of the provision of new and expansion of existing facilities needs to be identified in the policy.</p>	Support noted. It is for service providers and commercial businesses to take in account the growth of Cambridge and to make appropriate provision for the delivery of their services in the future.	

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Decision on CE24 Publicly Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach. The AAP should recognise the role that voluntary bodies could play in helping to provide community services.

CE25 Commercially Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

6527	Object	Services and facilities must be in place before the 2000 homes are built north of Newmarket Road.	The main part of the development cannot come forward until the Airport relocates and the AAP will be reviewed early to help with this. It will not be possible in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will be needed for the development of the full urban quarter at Cambridge East. However, it will include a list of the requirements of the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at that time. In addition, the AAP will also include a timetable for the provision of services, facilities and infrastructure, and require trigger points to be identified to ensure that those needed at every stage of the development of Cambridge East are available.	
4057 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4256 - Sport England 1847 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the objective of securing commercial sports facilities (through planning obligations) that will be essential for the successful establishment of the community.	Support noted.	
6485 - Royal Mail Group	Support	The requirement to expand services will be a direct result of the major development area at Cambridge East. RMG will be seeking financial and/or other planning contributions to meet the direct impact of the development and need to expand capacity or other implications that result from this scheme.	Support noted. It is for service providers and commercial businesses to take in account the growth of Cambridge and to make appropriate provision for the delivery of their services in the future.	

Decision on CE25 Commercially Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

CE26 Education: Preference for Community Schools - Preferred Approach

1092

Object

I am concerned by this development at several levels. My comments would apply to most proposed development in and around Cambridge. A reliable and effective Public transport system is not yet in place to cope with additional volumes of people traveling into Cambridge. There are current bottlenecks at every major route including Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton & Newmarket Road. Could school buses alleviate the pressure and the need for parents to drive children into school? Has it been identified who could/could not use public transport i.e. the elderly, disabled, young children, and what is being provided to cater for these needs? Have the emergency services been consulted in respect of congestion, accessibility to areas, increase of staffing resources to cope with additional population. Why does the housing have to be high density, 12,000 houses crammed in with 50% allocated to housing association will lead to ghetto areas. Cambourne facilities to support new housing were not put into place as agreed - what guarantees are there that the same won't happen here? When is development going to start? Is it dependant on Marshalls vacating? Is there a time limit of when this development needs to commence?

The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. High density is not inconsistent with high quality. The AAP is particularly focused on bringing forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, but within a framework for the wider development. The new urban quarter will need to provide services and facilities to meet the needs of its residents and the AAP will include policies to secure their timely provision at trigger points throughout the development. Transport will be a key issue to resolve for this development and this is addressed under the transport options. The relocation of Marshall's is subject to a separate ongoing process. However, Phase 1 can come forward with the Airport operational.

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE26 Education: Preference for Community Schools - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4490 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 8.17 It should be noted that the County's preference is for the secondary school not to be located within the District centre, in view of the potential management and security issues this can raise.	Comment noted. Paragraph 8.17 does not specify the location of the secondary school but identifies key issues to be taken into account in determining its location. In particular it should be accessible to residents of the urban quarter as a whole and located on a stop on the high quality public transport route. This could be at the District Centre or a Local Centre. In view of the County Council's concerns about a location at the District Centre, the approach should be to locate the secondary school at a Local Centre.	The AAP should make it clear that the secondary school will not be located in the district centre in view of potential management and security issues, but should be located at a local centre at a stop on the high quality public transport route.
4491 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2520 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 1849 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the principle that primary schools will help to provide a community focus for the district and local centres, out of which other community service providers will operate.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE26 Education: Preference for Community Schools - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach. The AAP should make it clear that the secondary school should not be located in the district centre in view of potential management and security issues.

CE27 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements - Option 1 - Alternative Option

4058 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2623 - RAVE 4106 - Sport England 3387 1662	Object	Object because school playing fields should not count as public open spaces. Sufficient open space needs to be included in the plan.	Whilst dual use of sports pitches at primary and secondary schools is desirable, this cannot usually be ensured in the longer term and they do not normally count towards public open space standards.	
3771 1850 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support for playing fields at schools should be regarded as community facilities, available to the community.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE27 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Option 1 not to be pursued.

8. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

CE28 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements - Option 2 - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE28 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements - Option 2 - Alternative Option</i>				
4059 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6046 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 2523 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 2638 - RAVE 4101 - Sport England 2244 1664 1852 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support that open spaces are needed but not to include playing field from school.	Support noted.	Pursue option CE28 in the AAP.
Decision on CE28 Education: Playing Fields as Contributions to Open Space Requirements - Option 2 - Alternative Option				
Pursue option CE28.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE29 Faith - Preferred Approach</i>				
1666	Object	Any buildings to meet perceived "Faith needs" should be provided by "Faith groups" and not from the public purse.	The over arching principle for the funding of the services, facilities and infrastructure that will be needed at Cambridge East is that they will be funded in full by the development.	
2046 - Cambridge Community Church Trust	Object	Cambridge Community Church Trust is a faith group which, probably like others, has a significant requirement for land to meet its growing needs in the city itself and in the proposed urban quarter. However, this policy should be more specific. Since the community will be making subsidised land/buildings available through the system of planning obligations, faith groups which can demonstrate their ability and commitment to making a positive contribution to the social needs of the Cambridge community at large should be given preference. A sequential approach should be enshrined in this policy to best achieve this purpose.	This is not a matter for the AAP.	
4492 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2042 - Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council 1853 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support for the provision of appropriate buildings for worship in Cambridge East. Consultation with faith groups is needed to establish what is required.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE29 Faith - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

CE30 Emergency Services - Preferred Approach

1093	Object	<p>I am concerned by this development at several levels. My comments would apply to most proposed development in and around Cambridge. A reliable and effective Public transport system is not yet in place to cope with additional volumes of people traveling into Cambridge. There are current bottlenecks at every major route including Coldhams Lane, Cherry Hinton & Newmarket Road. Could school buses alleviate the pressure and the need for parents to drive children into school? Has it been identified who could/could not use public transport i.e. the elderly, disabled, young children, and what is being provided to cater for these needs? Have the emergency services been consulted in respect of congestion, accessibility to areas, increase of staffing resources to cope with additional population. Why does the housing have to be high density, 12,000 houses crammed in with 50% allocated to housing association will lead to ghetto areas. Cambourne facilities to support new housing were not put into place as agreed - what guarantees are there that the same won't happen here? When is development going to start? Is it dependant on Marshalls vacating? Is there a time limit of when this development needs to commence?</p>	<p>The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. High density is not inconsistent with high quality. The AAP is particularly focused on bringing forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, but within a framework for the wider development. The new urban quarter will need to provide services and facilities to meet the needs of its residents and the AAP will include policies to secure their timely provision at trigger points throughout the development. Transport will be a key issue to resolve for this development and this is addressed under the transport options. The relocation of Marshall's is subject to a separate ongoing process. However, Phase 1 can come forward with the Airport operational. Emergency services have been consulted at both the statutory bodies consultation stage, in preparation of the Preferred Options report through partnership working with the County Council, and through the Preferred Options public participation.</p>	
------	--------	--	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2993	Object	This needs to be a stronger commitment, i.e. it is done first. Infrastructure lag means that until after development is complete improvement works will always be catching up with the latest roads bottleneck that has been created. All residents of east Cambridge cannot be put at risk because emergency services cannot get to them quickly. Therefore service provision needs to be in place from day one even in a temporary (only a few years) location.	The main part of the development cannot come forward until the Airport relocates and the AAP will be reviewed early to help with this. It will not be possible in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will be needed for the development of the full urban quarter at Cambridge East. However, it will include a list of the requirements of the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at that time. In addition, the AAP will also include a timetable for the provision of services, facilities and infrastructure, and require trigger points to be identified to ensure that those needed at every stage of the development of Cambridge East are available.	
5590	Object	Will Fen Ditton have more policemen?	This is not a matter for the AAP.	
4060 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1854 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support working with the emergency services in order to identify their requirements.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE30 Emergency Services - Preferred Approach				
Pursue preferred approach.				
CE31 Leisure, Art & Culture - Preferred Option				
4493 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1930 - Arts Council England East 1855 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support for the policy that the new urban quarter could contribute to the leisure needs of the sub region as well as the immediate new residents, provided that facilities are in highly accessible locations.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE31 Leisure, Art & Culture - Preferred Option				
Pursue option CE31.				

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE32 Leisure, Art & Culture - Alternative Option

4061 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1856 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support that some of the facilities might have a City or sub-regional function.	Support noted.
---	---------	---	----------------

Decision on CE32 Leisure, Art & Culture - Alternative Option

Do not pursue Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

9. Addressing Transport Needs

CE33 Transport for North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

3773	Object	No connection to High Ditch Road should be envisaged even for public transport	It would sensible to ensure a design that would not preclude the future provision of a public transport only access onto High Ditch Road at some point in the future. This link may be needed to provide a public transport connection to Cambridge Northern Fringe. Its implementation would depend upon its environmental impacts being acceptable after mitigation and subject to its benefits being proven.	It is recommended that the preferred approach to transport for North of Newmarket Road in CE33 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendment: <input type="checkbox"/> design should not prevent future provision of a public transport only access onto High Ditch Road
4494 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Development north of Newmarket Road would require vehicular access at 2 points.	Government advice is that developments of over 300 houses need more than one road access point to allow for access for essential traffic if the principal access point is blocked. Our assessment is that scope exists to provide two access points over the two phases of development, one on either side of the park and ride site. For the first phase there is scope to provide the main access point to the west of the park and ride site and the second either as a spur from the park and ride access road or to the east of the park and ride site. There may be scope to make the second access point limited access for emergency vehicles and public transport only. There may also be scope to use the existing access road to the north works site to service this development.	The preferred approach to transport for North of Newmarket Road in CE33 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendment: <input type="checkbox"/> two road access points to Newmarket Road

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4840 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	It is likely that land North of Newmarket Road will be phased before the remainder of the Cambridge Airport site. If this occurs it could be very difficult to argue that the developers of the first phase should contribute towards improvements to the A14 and other highway works which are a direct consequence of the development of the remainder of the site. The argument is reinforced by CE33 being prescriptive about the facilities that a development of 1500-2000 dwellings would be expected to provide.	Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. It would be reasonable in addition to ensure that the development of the land north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction.	That the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2778 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 6528 5261 1781 1094 1041	Object	Object because the already major traffic problems will be exacerbated by this new development.	<p>Most of the objections relate to the principle of development in this location on the grounds that the public transport provisions will be inadequate and local roads will not be able to cope. This opinion is not shared by the County Council as local transport authority. Moreover the principle of the development has already been decided through the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Nevertheless the County Council are currently undertaking a County Strategic Transport Study of all of the developments planned for the County with the intention of testing their impact and providing appropriate transport solutions. Final publication is expected in October / November 2005: It will inform the examination in public of the Area Action Plan expected in early 2006, which will examine the soundness of the plan including its road access proposals. Until the study is published there is no basis for any alternative to the preferred approach to transport set out in CE33.</p> <p>To help ensure a modal shift in favour of cycling and walking the most appropriate car parking standards would be those specified in CE48 (City Council Redeposit Local Plan Standards) as these are below PPG13 levels.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the preferred approach to transport for North of Newmarket Road in CE33 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendment:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> car parking standards at Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan levels</p>
6486 - Royal Mail Group	Object	RMG require that all new development, especially commercial development has suitable service access in order that they are able to fulfil their statutory undertakers role in postal services.	Noted. The development will be subject to a transport assessment to ensure that it has adequate service access.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2527 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 5194 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 4537 5589 1861 - The Marshall Group	Support	Generally supportive of the preferred approach to provision of transport north of Newmarket Road set out in CE33.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE33 Transport for North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach subject to the following amendments:

- 1) two road access points to Newmarket Road
- 2) car parking standards at Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan levels
- 3) design should not prevent future provision of a public transport only access onto High Ditch Road
- 4) the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE34 Road Access - Preferred Approach</i>				
5022 - Teversham Parish Council 5021 - Teversham Parish Council 2669 - RAVE 6397 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group 2832 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 6391 - Lady Jane Court Residents Association 5091 5026 4933 3390 3000 2387 2738 1782 1225 1095 1671	Object	Existing roads already heavily congested. Nothing suggests this will improve, and with many extra cars, things will only get worse, unless extra road provision is included. Concern for environmental impact also expressed.	In order to minimise the impact of the development on the transport network it is necessary to include all-purpose junctions onto all of the principal roads surrounding the site including Barnwell Road. However the Area Action Plan does not have to be specific regarding their locations and this is not yet possible before the necessary detailed transport assessments have been done and masterplanning progressed. It should be possible to utilise the existing Barnwell Drive junction to avoid the Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A link through the LNR should be avoided. Given the location of the green corridor adjoining Teversham, and the extent of the development area north of Cherry Hinton, it is accepted that the link to Airport Way should be at the Gazelle Way roundabout. The County Council are currently undertaking a County Strategic Transport Study of all of the developments planned for the County with the intention of providing appropriate transport solutions. Final publication is expected in October / November 2005: It will inform the examination in public of the Area Action Plan expected in early 2006, which will examine the soundness of the plan including its road access proposals.	The preferred approach to road access in CE34 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendments: <input type="checkbox"/> access to Airport Way to be only at the Gazelle Way roundabout <input type="checkbox"/> access to Barnwell Road to avoid crossing the Local Nature Reserve and otherwise to minimise the impact on the reserve.
4495 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1862 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for CE34 and suggested all purpose junctions.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE34 Road Access - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach subject to the following amendments: access to Airport Way to be only at the Gazelle Way roundabout access to Barnwell Road to avoid crossing the Local Nature Reserve and otherwise to minimise the impact on the reserve.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE35 Orbital Movements - Option 1 - Alternative Option</i>				
5023 - Teversham Parish Council 2676 - RAVE 4846 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3302 - Highways Agency 5085 5030 3006 1783	Object	Orbital road should be opposed, as it will create a ring road effect, encouraging future development up to its boundary. It will also generate extra traffic.	There is little support or justification for new orbital road building and only limited support for improving the capacity of existing roads. If a new orbital road does prove to be needed at some time in the future, a public transport only road would be likely to attract the most public support. No route or specification for such a link has been developed. Accordingly orbital movements should be catered for by limited improvements to the capacity of existing routes because new links do not appear to be needed to support the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. The overall need for new orbital road building either for all traffic roads or for public transport routes only should be considered when the Cambridge East (AAP) is due for its first review, which will be informed by the outcome of the County Strategic Transport Study.	The approach to orbital movements set out in CE35 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP), and that the issue be a subject for further examination upon the review of the AAP.
4496 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2316 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support of improving orbital capacity on existing routes.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE35 Orbital Movements - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Pursue option 1 (CE35) subject to further examination upon the review of the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE36 Orbital Movements - Option 2 - Alternative Option</i>				
5024 - Teversham Parish Council 4497 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2680 - RAVE 4847 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3313 - Highways Agency 5086 5033 3007 2128 1680 1676 2319 - The Marshall Group	Object	Orbital roads are not the most efficient means of distributing travel movements and are likely to induce extra car travel.	There is little support or justification for new orbital road building and only limited support for improving the capacity of existing roads. If a new orbital road does prove to be needed at some time in the future, a public transport only road would be likely to attract the most public support. No route or specification for such a link has been developed. Accordingly orbital movements should be catered for by limited improvements to the capacity of existing routes because new links do not appear to be needed to support the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. The overall need for new orbital road building either for all traffic roads or for public transport routes only should be considered when the Cambridge East (AAP) is due for its first review, which will be informed by the outcome of the County Strategic Transport Study.	The approach to orbital movements set out in CE35 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP), and that the issue be a subject for further examination upon the review of the AAP.
6048 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 4538 2246 1784	Support	General support to build additional orbital road which would be for all traffic.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE36 Orbital Movements - Option 2 - Alternative Option

Do not pursue Option 2 (CE36). Pursue option 1 (CE35) subject to further examination upon the review of the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE37 Orbital Movements - Option 3 - Alternative Option</i>				
4848 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3315 - Highways Agency 5087 5034 3009 1785 2321 - The Marshall Group	Object	Objection to orbital road because: 1) it will create a ring road effect 2) it will encourage future development up to its boundary 3) it will generate extra traffic 4) public transport doesn't usually move orbitally.	There is little support or justification for new orbital road building and only limited support for improving the capacity of existing roads. If a new orbital road does prove to be needed at some time in the future, a public transport only road would be likely to attract the most public support. No route or specification for such a link has been developed. Accordingly orbital movements should be catered for by limited improvements to the capacity of existing routes because new links do not appear to be needed to support the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. The overall need for new orbital road building either for all traffic roads or for public transport routes only should be considered when the Cambridge East (AAP) is due for its first review, which will be informed by the outcome of the County Strategic Transport Study.	The approach to orbital movements set out in CE35 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP), and that the issue be a subject for further examination upon the review of the AAP.
5025 - Teversham Parish Council 4498 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2687 - RAVE 3394 2662 1686	Support	General support of orbital routes, which would be open to public transport only.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE37 Orbital Movements - Option 3 - Alternative Option

Do not pursue Option 3 (CE37). Pursue option 1 (CE35) subject to further examination upon the review of the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

CE38 A14 Interchanges - Option 1 - Alternative Option

3960 - English Nature,
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire
Team

POLICIES 38-41 - COMMENT
English Nature would wish to advise that
Wilbraham Fen SSSI lies to the immediate south of
the Quy interchange. The SSSI supports reed bed
and marshy grassland habitats. These habitats
support a range of breeding and wintering birds,
some of which are rare both nationally and in the
County. We would welcome any move towards
reducing disturbance, particularly traffic noise
levels and movements, at this junction.

Comment noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5027 - Teversham Parish Council 4499 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5196 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 2725 - RAVE 4856 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3362 - Highways Agency 6530 5090 5041 3127 3016 2389 2400 1790 1788 1122 1487 1112 1096 1691 2326 - The Marshall Group	Object	Concerns expressed regarding: 1. capacity of local roads and traffic congestion 2. noise pollution 3. environmental issues	<p>There is greater support (and fewer objections), for the retention of the existing junctions (CE40), than for the creation of a new junction to replace the two existing junctions (CE38), or for the conversion of the Ditton Lane junction to public transport only (CE39), or for the provision of a new interchange replacing Ditton Lane (CE41).</p> <p>Option CE40 retains convenient access to the A14 for local people and will suffice for the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. The County have however objected that the closure of the Quy junction would hamper access to Newmarket using the A1303, this is a strong argument for the retention of Quy junction.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the policy of the Highways Agency to minimise the number of access points onto the trunk road network, the scale and location of the Cambridge East development taken as a whole will inevitably impact upon the A14. It has yet to be determined how best to provide improved access to the A14 whilst minimising those impacts. The County Strategic Transport Study will be a important step in this regard.</p> <p>The Highways Agency have stated in their representations that they would welcome the opportunity to engage and help to develop an access strategy which will include consideration of the cumulative impacts of development in the Cambridge Sub-region, as well as transport measures which could restrict movement in the city</p>	<p>That the preferred approach to A14 access for inclusion in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road <input type="checkbox"/> that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 <input type="checkbox"/> that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>centre and further increase pressures on the A14, M11, A11 and A428. The impact of planned developments in and close to Cambridge will be an important factor to be taken into account in their own consultation on the future treatment of this section of the A14.</p> <p>Our advice is that the existing junctions should be retained in respect of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The form of that development should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 dependent upon the outcome of further studies. In respect of the longer term and the development of the Airport site itself, the AAP should expect improved and satisfactory access to the A14 without ruling out either of the options of junction improvement or provision of a new junction.</p>	

Decision on CE38 A14 Interchanges - Option 1 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE40 subject to the following amendments: no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE39 A14 Interchanges - Option 2 - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5029 - Teversham Parish Council 3961 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4500 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2733 - RAVE 4857 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3365 - Highways Agency 6531 5092 5042 2390 2409 1786 1123 1697	Object	Object because developments will all use inadequate, unsuitable, and already congested roads for increased traffic.	There is greater support (and fewer objections), for the retention of the existing junctions (CE40), than for the creation of a new junction to replace the two existing junctions (CE38), or for the conversion of the Ditton Lane junction to public transport only (CE39), or for the provision of a new interchange replacing Ditton Lane (CE41). Option CE40 retains convenient access to the A14 for local people and will suffice for the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. The County have however objected that the closure of the Quy junction would hamper access to Newmarket using the A1303, this is a strong argument for the retention of Quy junction. Notwithstanding the policy of the Highways Agency to minimise the number of access points onto the trunk road network, the scale and location of the Cambridge East development taken as a whole will inevitably impact upon the A14. It has yet to be determined how best to provide improved access to the A14 whilst minimising those impacts. The County Strategic Transport Study will be a important step in this regard. The Highways Agency have stated in their representations that they would welcome the opportunity to engage and help to develop an access strategy which will include consideration of the cumulative impacts of development in the Cambridge Subregion, as well as transport measures which could restrict movement in the city centre and further increase pressures on the A14, M11, A11 and A428. The impact of planned developments in and close to Cambridge will be an important factor to be taken into account in their own consultation on the future	That the preferred approach to A14 access for inclusion in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) be as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road <input type="checkbox"/> that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 <input type="checkbox"/> that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			treatment of this section of the A14. It is therefore proposed that the existing junctions should be retained in respect of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The form of that development should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 dependent upon the outcome of further studies. In respect of the longer term and the development of the Airport site itself, the AAP should expect improved and satisfactory access to the A14 without ruling out either of the options of junction improvement or provision of a new junction.	
5195 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 3777 2327 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support of CE39, relying on two existing interchanges to the A14, but restricting Ditton Lane interchange to public transport only.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE39 A14 Interchanges - Option 2 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE40 subject to the following amendments: no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE40 A14 Interchanges - Option 3 - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3962 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4501 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5197 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 2736 - RAVE 4858 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3370 - Highways Agency 6532 1787 1124	Object	Objections arise from the following concerns: 1) the unsuitability of Ditton Lane as a heavily congested through road for access to the A14 2) This option would not meet the Structure Plan requirement for a new access on to the A14 3) would be enormously destructive of what remains of the countryside in the area.	There is greater support (and fewer objections), for the retention of the existing junctions (CE40), than for the creation of a new junction to replace the two existing junctions (CE38), or for the conversion of the Ditton Lane junction to public transport only (CE39), or for the provision of a new interchange replacing Ditton Lane (CE41). Option CE40 retains convenient access to the A14 for local people and will suffice for the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. The County have however objected that the closure of the Quy junction would hamper access to Newmarket using the A1303, this is a strong argument for the retention of Quy junction. Notwithstanding the policy of the Highways Agency to minimise the number of access points onto the trunk road network, the scale and location of the Cambridge East development taken as a whole will inevitably impact upon the A14. It has yet to be determined how best to provide improved access to the A14 whilst minimising those impacts. The County Strategic Transport Study will be a important step in this regard. The Highways Agency have stated in their representations that they would welcome the opportunity to engage and help to develop an access strategy which will include consideration of the cumulative impacts of development in the Cambridge Subregion, as well as transport measures which could restrict movement in the city centre and further increase pressures on the A14, M11, A11 and A428. The impact of planned developments in and close to Cambridge will be an important factor to be taken into account in their own consultation on the future	That the preferred approach to A14 access for inclusion in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) be as follows: <input type="checkbox"/> no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road <input type="checkbox"/> that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 <input type="checkbox"/> that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			treatment of this section of the A14. It is therefore proposed that the existing junctions should be retained in respect of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The form of that development should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 dependent upon the outcome of further studies. In respect of the longer term and the development of the Airport site itself, the AAP should expect improved and satisfactory access to the A14 without ruling out either of the options of junction improvement or provision of a new junction.	
5031 - Teversham Parish Council 6050 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 4922 2249 2435 1694 2331 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for keeping existing configuration of interchanges at Ditton Lane and Quy with the A14, with only junction improvements.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE40 A14 Interchanges - Option 3 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE40 subject to the following amendments: no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE41 A14 Interchanges - Option 4 - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5032 - Teversham Parish Council 3963 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 5198 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 2740 - RAVE 4860 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3386 - Highways Agency 6533 1125 1488 1113 2333 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object with the following concerns: 1) Wilbraham Fen SSSI lies to the immediate south of the Quy interchange 2) raise pressure for a road to be created from the residential site onto High Ditch Road 3) unnecessary in traffic terms and would bring unnecessary engineering works into the green belt	There is greater support (and fewer objections), for the retention of the existing junctions (CE40), than for the creation of a new junction to replace the two existing junctions (CE38), or for the conversion of the Ditton Lane junction to public transport only (CE39), or for the provision of a new interchange replacing Ditton Lane (CE41). Option CE40 retains convenient access to the A14 for local people and will suffice for the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. The County have however objected that the closure of the Quy junction would hamper access to Newmarket using the A1303, this is a strong argument for the retention of Quy junction. Notwithstanding the policy of the Highways Agency to minimise the number of access points onto the trunk road network, the scale and location of the Cambridge East development taken as a whole will inevitably impact upon the A14. It has yet to be determined how best to provide improved access to the A14 whilst minimising those impacts. The County Strategic Transport Study will be a important step in this regard. The Highways Agency have stated in their representations that they would welcome the opportunity to engage and help to develop an access strategy which will include consideration of the cumulative impacts of development in the Cambridge Subregion, as well as transport measures which could restrict movement in the city centre and further increase pressures on the A14, M11, A11 and A428. The impact of planned developments in and close to Cambridge will be an important factor to be taken into account in their own consultation on the future	That the preferred approach to A14 access for inclusion in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) be as follows: <input type="checkbox"/> no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road <input type="checkbox"/> that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 <input type="checkbox"/> that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			treatment of this section of the A14. It is therefore proposed that the existing junctions should be retained in respect of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The form of that development should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 dependent upon the outcome of further studies. In respect of the longer term and the development of the Airport site itself, the AAP should expect improved and satisfactory access to the A14 without ruling out either of the options of junction improvement or provision of a new junction.	
4502 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1789	Support	General support for providing a half interchange to ease traffic congestion in Honey Hill vicinity and retaining Quy interchange.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE41 A14 Interchanges - Option 4 - Alternative Option

Pursue option CE40 subject to the following amendments: no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, or the provision of a new junction onto the A14 that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE42 External Public Transport - Preferred Approach</i>				
5035 - Teversham Parish Council 5200 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 2834 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5078 5044 5764 3122 3024 2731 2050 1483 3779 1042 1698	Object	Object because: 1) document does not recognise the Archaeological importance of Fleam Dyke 2) a guided bus route through Coldhams Common could sever the green corridor and/or damage areas of ecological value	The site has been identified by the Structure Plan for a strategic scale of development. It cannot be expected that such a development would not have environmental implications although every effort will be required to minimise these and mitigate any harm. Whilst many of the proposed routes would run on existing roads others may need to cross existing open spaces in the City. The transport case for such links will not be clarified until the publication of the County Strategic Transport Study, which will allow the transport case to be considered alongside the environmental implications of such routes. However, no such links are necessary to enable the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road to proceed (CE33). Furthermore some of the routes would cross open spaces which lie outside the boundary of the AAP (Coldhams Common / Ditton Meadows) and so could not be proposals in the AAP but would require to be taken forward as a part of a separate City Council Local Development Document. Our advice is therefore to endorse the referred approach subject to a future review of the AAP and coordination of transport route proposals with the City Council Local Development Scheme.	Add a statement concerning the need to minimise and mitigate the environmental impacts of the public transport routes.
4503 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4653 - Toft Parish Council 1865 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for providing high quality public transport that will be initiated quickly.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on CE42 External Public Transport - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach. Add a statement concerning the need to minimise and mitigate the environmental impacts of the public transport routes.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE43 Park and Ride - Preferred Approach</i>				
1477	Object	I object to a new Park & Ride at the interchange at Honey Hill. This seems a complete waste of public money and illustrates a lack of understanding of problems regarding traffic movement in Cambridge. See also my comments to CE38 & CE41.	The Preferred Options report does not include an option for a new Park & Ride site at Honey Hill.	
2746 - RAVE	Object	There does not appear to be any pressing need to relocate this site. It will not be used by residents from any new development if public transport provision is properly planned and provided.	The Park & Ride site is well wooded and provides an opportunity for a mature park for the area north of Newmarket Road. Its relocation would permit this and allow for a marginal improvement in the weight of traffic on Newmarket Road by intercepting it slightly further to the east, rather than within the new urban quarter. Overall the benefits for residents living north of Newmarket Road would be greater from having access to a centrally located park with mature landscaping, than from having access to a centrally located Park & Ride site. The main purpose of the Park and Ride is to serve those travelling into Cambridge from outside. It is proposed that the new urban quarter will have its own High Quality Public Transport running through it and linking with the City Centre and other key destinations. Good public transport links are not dependent upon its retention.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4830 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The rationale for the relocation of the Park & Ride facility from its existing site to the north of Newmarket Road is weak and does not provide sufficient justification to seek the removal of a further 7 ha of land from the green belt. The functional transport benefits alluded to within the supporting text to CE63 are only minimal. The question has to be raised as to whether there are overriding financial benefits which could result from including this land within the proposed residential development thereby freeing up additional land for housing?	<p>The Park & Ride site is well wooded and provides an opportunity for a mature park for the area north of Newmarket Road. Its relocation would permit this and allow for a marginal improvement in the weight of traffic on Newmarket Road by intercepting it slightly further to the east, rather than within the new urban quarter. The proposed relocation site would adjoin the proposed site of the country park and could offer dual use to provide for its parking needs. The adjacent country park and the proposed Park and Ride site are both in the ownership of the Marshall Group and are deliverable which is an important consideration.</p> <p>The new Park & Ride site would be retained as Green Belt as are the majority of the other sites around Cambridge. If no longer needed as Park & Ride site any future use would have to be appropriate in the Green Belt.</p>	
5036 - Teversham Parish Council 4936 2051 1699	Object	The North side of Newmarket Road east of Airport way would be better location for Park and Ride, which should have as close and direct access as possible to the A14, without travelling far on a congested road.	<p>The proposed relocation site would adjoin the proposed site of the Country Park and could offer dual use to provide for its parking needs. The adjacent country park and the proposed Park and Ride site are both in the ownership of the Marshall Group and are deliverable which is an important consideration.</p> <p>The new Park & Ride site would be an open landscaped site with only minimal built development. As the landscaping matures it will increasingly appear as a wooded area. It would be retained within the Green Belt and so provide for long-term separation between Teversham and the edge of Cambridge.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2530 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 5079 5049	Object	Object because Park and Ride should remain where it is. If alternative site is required this should be to the north of Newmarket Road.	The Park & Ride site is well wooded and provides an opportunity for a mature park for the area north of Newmarket Road. Its relocation would permit this and allow for a marginal improvement in the weight of traffic on Newmarket Road by intercepting it slightly further to the east, rather than within the new urban quarter. Overall the benefits for residents living north of Newmarket Road would be greater from having access to a centrally located park with mature landscaping, than from having access to a centrally located Park & Ride site. Good public transport links are not dependent upon its retention.	
6529	Object	The Park & Ride should be moved further East possibly beyond Quy, so it can be approached from multiple directions and won't funnel traffic along the A1303.	Whilst such a proposal may have long term benefits a satellite location could not provide for parking for the adjacent proposed Country Park and so is not favoured. It would also not be well located in relation to any new access to the A14 which would serve those travelling from the north and west.	
4504 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1185 1866 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support for identifying a new Park and Ride site.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE43 Park and Ride - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE44 External Cycle Links - Preferred Option</i>				
5202 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 1097 1043 2340 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object to any further encroachment onto the City commons by tarmac cycleways and leaving latitude for cycle routes of various kinds rather than being too prescriptive at this stage.	In order to help maximise the proportion of journeys made by cycle between Cambridge East and destinations within Cambridge it will be essential to provide dedicated, high quality and lit cycle only routes. Some of these routes may have to cross open spaces but these will be designed in a sensitive manner to minimise any harmful impacts on the environment and amenity. The AAP must provide guidance on these links in recognition of the scale of development at Cambridge East and the importance to the success of achieving modal shift.	
4062 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2533 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge 923 - The National Trust 4643 - Sport England 2782 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 6534 3398 3124 3028 2453 2229 1190 1187 2678 1702	Support	General support for CE44, with concern that cycle infrastructure be well lit.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE44 External Cycle Links - Preferred Option

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE45 External Cycle Links - Alternative Option</i>				
4063 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2052 1703 2351 - The Marshall Group	Object	Object because lighting is essential for personal security and general cycle usage.	In order to help maximise the proportion of journeys made by cycle between Cambridge East and destinations within Cambridge it will be essential to provide dedicated, high quality and lit cycle only routes. Some of these routes may have to cross open spaces but these will be designed in a sensitive manner to minimise any harmful impacts on the environment and amenity. The AAP must provide guidance on these links in recognition of the scale of development at Cambridge East and the importance of achieving modal shift to its success.	

Decision on CE45 External Cycle Links - Alternative Option

Do not pursue the Alternative Option.

CE46 External Cycle Links - Rejected Option

4064 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2135 1189 1188 2354 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support.	Support noted.	
---	---------	------------------	----------------	--

Decision on CE46 External Cycle Links - Rejected Option

Do not pursue the Rejected Option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE47 Internal Trips - Preferred Approach</i>				
3030	Object	Targets for bus stops mean nothing if: a) The buses don't go where people want to go b) The buses cannot cope with people with shopping	Bus routing and bus quality are not matters for the AAP beyond what can be required through a legal agreement concerning the development. This is likely to specify routes and may be able to specify bus standards.	
4065 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5203 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 4644 - Sport England 2230 2683 1867 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for network of dedicated and segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists within the development,	Support noted.	

Decision on CE47 Internal Trips - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE48 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Option</i>				
3625 - GO-East	Object	As a JOINT Area Action Plan covering the whole Cambridge East site, the AAP should not delegate policy matters directly relevant to the site to other plans. Consideration should be given to a challenging approach to the parking strategy.	The intention is to include the parking standards within the AAP itself. Given that the development of the District Centre can only commence after the relocation of the runway dependent businesses it is not thought necessary to specify more restrictive parking measures at this stage. This matter can be considered again upon the review of the AAP.	Include City Redeposit Local Plan parking standards within the AAP.
4505 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2233 2366 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support, though standard of parking provision will need to be reviewed with the passage of time.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE48 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Option				
Pursue preferred approach. Include parking Standards within the AAP.				
<i>CE49 Car Parking Standards - Alternative Option</i>				
2234 2379 - The Marshall Group	Object	General objection to stringent approach. Central parking zone standards are wholly inappropriate for application on an edge of Cambridge site.	The intention is to include the parking standards within the AAP itself. Given that the development of the District Centre can only commence after the relocation of the runway dependent businesses it is not thought necessary to specify more restrictive parking measures at this stage. This matter can be considered again upon the review of the AAP.	
4506 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	More stringent parking standards should be applied to areas of high-density development.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE49 Car Parking Standards - Alternative Option				
Pursue preferred approach.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
10. Landscape and Biodiversity				
<i>CE50 Landscape - Preferred Approach</i>				
2931	Object	The policy should include statements of landscape requirements on the relocated Marshalls Aerospace site.	The relocation of the airport and requirements of that move are not part of this AAP. It is proposed that a landscape strategy would be developed for the whole of Cambridge East which includes Marshalls Aerospace site.	
2783	Object	I would like to see some of the construction spoil used to create a "mini-mountain" from which views across and out of the site could be obtained. Precisely because such a feature would be untypical of the area, I think it's needed. Otherwise I have no problems with CE50.	It is considered appropriate that any construction spoil should be distributed over a wide area within the site in order to ensure that new ground levels do not affect visual amenity or the landscape character of the area. High bunding is not appropriate in this generally flat location. Other landscape treatments will be used to provide suitable visual screening.	
3808 - English Heritage	Object	Landscape. This policy should state that the proposed landscaping strategy will take account of the Historic Landscape Characterisation database. Where new planting is being considered, the HLC analysis can provide a framework based on the historic evolution of the site.	Disagree because this heavily managed airport site has very little historic landscape character remaining.	
5037 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Para 10.6 The green separation between Teversham and the City must be clearly defined and the boundaries safeguarded from future development in order to comply with CE50.	In view of the proposal to define the Green Belt boundary in this AAP and refine it if necessary in the review of the plan, it is now possible to define the boundaries of the Green Corridor in the AAP, part of which will also provide green separation from Teversham village. This issue is addressed at Option CE64.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5096 5076	Object	Green separation should be provided along Airport Way to ensure retaining Teversham in its own right and maintaining its own identity. This should be a minimum of 300m (the width of the green corridor) or more, measured from the existing Airport fencing. The existing public footpath to Cherry Hinton between the airport and the fields adjacent to airport way, must be retained and upgraded to include a cycle path.	In view of the proposal to define the Green Belt boundary in this AAP and refine it if necessary in the review of the plan, it is now possible to define the boundaries of the Green Corridor in the AAP, part of which will also provide green separation from Teversham village. This issue is addressed at Option CE64. The site boundary will run along Airport Way and Newmarket Road and will include within it strategic landscaping in appropriate locations on the outer edge of the urban quarter. The width and character of that landscaping is most appropriately addressed at the masterplanning stage. The AAP could set out the criteria for assessing that landscaping. However, it is not considered in principle that a landscaping belt of 300m in depth is required along the length of Airport Way in order to maintain village identity. This issue was discussed at the Stakeholder Workshop and the group considered that there was potential for a much narrower belt on the frontage mid way between the village and the Airport Way roundabout with Newmarket Road whilst maintaining village identity.	Add new bullet point to CE50 to read as follows: "-set criteria for the strategic landscaping of the site, including along Airport Way and in areas of green separation from villages."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3958 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3953 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4066 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6444 - The Countryside Agency 924 - The National Trust 2836 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3782 2689 1710 1868 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support proposed production of landscape strategy and the development of a network of green spaces within and around development that ensures a high degree of connectivity with the wider countryside.	Support noted.	
5080 5052 5582	Support	Support for the green corridor having tree planting and many wide spaces left for recreation.	Support noted. The landscape strategy will ensure that each part of the development area is landscaped, managed and protected where practical before much of the development is started and the appropriate landscaping is completed promptly upon the completion of each phase of development. Consideration will be given to requiring key aspects of strategic landscaping (eg within green separation) at the beginning of each major phase of development in order that it can mature and offer protection to local communities at the earliest opportunity.	

Decision on CE50 Landscape - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach and add:-

new bullet point - "set criteria for the strategic landscaping at the site, including along Airport Way and in areas of green separation from villages."

new bullet point - "give consideration to requiring key aspects of strategic landscaping (eg within green separation) at the beginning of each major phase of development."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE51 Biodiversity: Habitat Creation - Preferred Approach</i>				
2932 1044	Object	Object because there is no manner in which Biodiversity will be increased by a density and type of development as is proposed.	The function of the site as an Airport has resulted in a heavily managed landscape and the biodiversity of the area is perceived as poor. A key principle for the Cambridge East development will be to achieve a significant increase in biodiversity and the proposed Biodiversity and Landscape Strategy will help ensure the creation, retention and management of key habitats.	
5081 5059	Object	Object because an addition to this should be that sections of Airport Way, Coldhams Lane and Barnwell Road be tunnelled in order to achieve an actual green corridor and not one bisected with major roads.	Road and bus crossings in the green corridor will be limited to those that are necessary for the functioning of the urban quarter as a whole and allow for integration between areas north and south of the green corridor. Any crossings should be well designed and complement the landscape character.	
3957 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3956 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3955 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4067 - Cambridgeshire County Council 925 - The National Trust 4761 - Environment Agency 4755 - Environment Agency 2837 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3120 1714 1871 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support of the green corridor and urban park, which will assist in improving Biodiversity, and the creation of water features. Footpaths can be used to create semi-natural grassland along them which will further enhance the biodiversity value of the area.	Support noted.	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD*****Decision on CE51 Biodiversity: Habitat Creation - Preferred Approach**

Pursue preferred approach.

CE52 Biodiversity: Water Feature - Preferred Approach

3954 - English Nature,
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire
Team

Support

Support for the innovative use of the measures
described to help achieve wildlife gain and habitats.

Support noted.

3952 - English Nature,
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire
Team

4068 - Cambridgeshire County
Council

4759 - Environment Agency

2839 - Wildlife Trust for
Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire,
Northamptonshire & Peterborough

1872 - The Marshall Group

Decision on CE52 Biodiversity: Water Feature - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE53 Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan - Preferred Approach</i>				
2841 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the preferred approach, however this management strategy must be drawn up before the development commences	Support noted.	
3951 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	Supports landscape and biodiversity management.	Support noted.	
3950 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team				
4069 - Cambridgeshire County Council				
2693				
1717				
1874 - The Marshall Group				
Decision on CE53 Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan - Preferred Approach				
Pursue preferred approach.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
11. Archaeology & Heritage				
<i>CE54 Archaeology - Preferred Approach</i>				
3809 - English Heritage	Object	An archaeological assessment should be submitted as part of any planning application, to enable the assessment to influence the form of the development. Archaeological implications must be understood at the earliest stage, not just prior to development, but prior to planning permission. We suggest the policy is worded: 'will be undertaken, and submitted as part of the planning application for development, to ensure the archaeological implications are understood and, as far as possible, any adverse impacts are mitigated. Any important remains will then be protected'.	Accepted.	Revise policy in AAP to read: "...will be undertaken, and submitted as part of any planning application for development, to ensure the archaeological implications are understood and, as far as possible, any adverse impacts are mitigated. Any important remains will then be protected'.
1875 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
4070 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	This is considered to be adequate, however there are concerns over the comments in the SEA Scoping Report. The purpose of mitigation is to provide the best treatment of archaeological remains, artefacts and deposits. There seems to be very little recognition of this by the consultancy. PPG16 clearly states that excavation should be regarded as a second best option and that where nationally important remains are concerned there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. This is at least recognised in the preferred option.	Support for approach noted. The initial assessment background table did consider the impact of the option on archaeology but made clear that the actual impact would be dependent on the outcome of the assessment required by the option. At this time, they therefore identified the impact as neutral. The concerns raised in respect of SEA scoping report should be considered by the independent consultants. The Councils will ensure the comments are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.	Advise SEA/SA consultants of concerns expressed and ensure that they are taken into account in the appraisal of the AAP for submission.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on CE54 Archaeology - Preferred Approach

Pursue the preferred approach and revise policy in AAP to read:

"...will be undertaken, and submitted as part of any planning application for development, to ensure the archaeological implications are understood and, as far as possible, any adverse impacts are mitigated. Any important remains will then be protected'.

Advise SEA/SA consultants of concerns expressed and ensure that they are taken into account in the appraisal of the AAP for submission.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE55 Built Heritage - Preferred Option</i>				
2933	Object	The same consideration should be given to the relocated Marshalls Aerospace site.	This is not a matter the Area Action Plan can consider as it will fall outside the plan area.	
2398 - The Marshall Group	Object	CE55. Marshall objects to CE55 and is supportive of CE56. In so doing, Marshall recognises its continuing responsibility both to the Control Building, which has recently been listed, as well as to the historic association between Marshall and the City. There may come to be a case for retaining the new Control Tower, to set it down as a requirement for attention goes too far. Any redevelopment in the vicinity of the listed Control Building will need to pay proper attention to its setting.	It is appropriate to require a detailed assessment to be undertaken of the heritage importance of the buildings which reflect the history of this part of Cambridge and their settings, and examination of the way in which they could contribute to the character of the new development. This is particularly relevant to those buildings with historic character which contribute to the setting of a Listed Building. The assessment should also consider the impact of the development on conservation areas in nearby communities.	Policy in AAP should require a detailed assessment to be undertaken to identify which significant airport buildings and structures and their settings are representative of a significant chapter in Cambridge's history, eg early hangars and the control tower, and may have potential to be retained and reused as positive features and landmarks in the future development.
4071 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council support the preferred option. We strongly disagree with the SEA Scoping Report, and do not consider perceived impacts on preliminary development plans to be an acceptable reason for the demolition of structures of intrinsic value to the historic environment, regardless of listed status.	Support noted. This seems to prejudge that the hangars have intrinsic value to the historic environment. The assessment referred to in paragraph 11.5 and proposed to be included in policy in the AAP, would identify which buildings are of historic value. SEA consultants should be advised of the concern expressed. The Councils will ensure that the concerns are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.	Advise SEA consultants of concerns raised and ensure that the issues are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.
6051 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 3810 - English Heritage 5584 2252	Support	General support for the approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE55 Built Heritage - Preferred Option

Pursue preferred option and ensure policy in AAP requires a detailed assessment to be undertaken to identify which significant airport buildings and structures and their settings are representative of a significant chapter in Cambridge's history, eg early hangars and the control tower, and may have potential to be retained and reused as positive features and landmarks in the future development.

Advise SEA consultants of concerns raised and ensure that the issues are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE56 Built Heritage - Alternative Option</i>				
4072 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3811 - English Heritage	Object	Support for the inclusive approach of the preferred option, and consequently oppose the alternative suggested in CE56.	Rejection of this alternative option noted.	
2401 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall objects to CE55 and is supportive of CE56. In so doing, Marshall recognises its continuing responsibility both to the Control Building, which has recently been listed, as well as to the historic association between Marshall and the City. There may come to be a case for retaining the new Control Tower, to set it down as a requirement for attention goes too far. Any redevelopment in the vicinity of the listed Control Building will need to pay proper attention to its setting.	It is proposed at CE55 to require a detailed assessment of the historic value of both listed and other structures to ensure an objective view is taken of those buildings which are of such merit that there is a justification for them to be incorporated into the development to recognise the historic role of the Airport in Cambridge.	

Decision on CE56 Built Heritage - Alternative Option

Do not pursue the alternative option CE56.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

12. Meeting Recreation Needs

CE57 Public Open Space - Preferred Option

3948 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Object	POLICY CE57 - COMMENT English Nature would recommend the adoption of the 'Accessible Green Space Standards' (see below), and would encourage the adoption of green open space, ie areas that would have benefit to wildlife and people.	Areas of green openspace are covered in greater detail elsewhere in the preferred options report. A standard for strategic openspace is being developed for the Cambridge Sub-Region, and this will guide provision at Cambridge East.	
3717 - GO-East	Object	As a JOINT Area Action Plan covering the whole Cambridge East site, the AAP should not delegate policy matters directly relevant to the site to other plans. The AAP (or a subsequent review if it is not considered possible to do this for the main Airport site at this stage) should therefore set out the open space standards to be applied to the site.	It is agreed that the appropriate standard to be used at Cambridge East be included in the AAP. The report sought to identify whether the City Redeposit Local Plan standards are appropriate. They will be included in the submission AAP.	Include the City Redeposit Local Plan public open space standards in the submission AAP.
1876 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option on the basis that proper allowance will be made for the availability of the green corridor as well as the proposed country park, to the north of Teversham.	Support noted. For clarity, the green corridor and country park will not contribute towards the public open space standards, apart from any provision in the green corridor which is specifically to meet the recreation needs of the adjoining built up area.	
1191 2696	Support	Support, but there must also be access for cycling and horse riding.	General support noted. Clearly cycling and horse riding will not be suited to all types of open space, but the preferred approach to development principles includes the goal of developing networks of paths & cycleways, and this will apply to open spaces.	
4073 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4647 - Sport England	Support	Support for use of the Cambridge City standard for this urban extension.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE57 Public Open Space - Preferred Option

Pursue preferred option and include the City Redeposit Local Plan public open space standards in the submission AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE58 Public Open Space - Alternative Option</i>				
4074 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4116 - Sport England	Object	Object to this approach.	Objection noted.	
1877 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option on the basis that proper allowance will be made for the availability of the green corridor as well as the proposed country park, to the north of Teversham.	Support noted. However, it is proposed to pursue Preferred Option CE57.	

Decision on CE58 Public Open Space - Alternative Option

Do not pursue alternative option CE58.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE59 Distance to Formal Sport - Preferred Approach</i>				
1880 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall suggests that the requirement should be expressed as a band rather than an absolute. It suggests that between 1,000 and 1,500 metres would be appropriate.	Support noted. However, the preferred approach sets a maximum of 1000m, with flexibility within that distance. This is considered the most that is reasonable to ensure accessible open space to all parts of the development.	
1192 2701	Support	Support. Must be provision for cycling and bridleways.	The preferred approach to development principles includes the goal of developing networks of paths & cycleways.	
3118	Support	Existing Abbey residents must also be able to benefit from new facilities.	Support noted. Existing residents will benefit from new facilities, as reflected in the preferred approach to development principles which includes 'link the new development with the urban fabric of eastern Cambridge and include facilities which can help serve the existing as well as new community'.	
4075 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4679 - Sport England	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE59 Distance to Formal Sport - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE60 Formal Sports Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
4305 - Sport England	Object	Suggests amendment of paragraph 12.9 to reflect the following considerations: Whilst Sport England supports the principle of the AAP providing details of the sports facilities that will need to be provided to meet the needs of development. However, objection is made to this paragraph, as it should be stated that the facilities listed are indicative of the needs of the development and will need to be refined following further assessment. Sport England have developed a more advanced needs assessment method which should be used to determine the nature and scale of provision. In addition, Sport England's facility planning tool is now known as the Sport Facility Calculator (no date), not the 2003 Sport England Facility Demand estimator.	The list in the AAP will make clear it is not comprehensive. It is acknowledged that further work is required to develop a Strategy for Formal Sports in CE60. In discussion with Sport England the Council will endeavour to use appropriate tools to assist the assessment.	
4684 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the principle of preparing a strategy for formal sports facility provision at Cambridge East, which will include detailed discussions with Sport England and Sports governing bodies. However, the preferred approach is objected to because for clarity, it should be confirmed what status the strategy will have in determining development requirements, ie will the development be required to provide the facilities identified in the strategy. To address this objection, it is requested that a sentence be added to the preferred approach, which confirms how the strategy will be used in determining development requirements, ie will the development be required to provide the facilities identified in the strategy.	Facilities will be required to meet the needs of residents. The AAP will require a strategy to be prepared to identify the requirements of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The Strategy will also need to consider those requirements in the context of likely needs of the development as a whole, although it is recognised that the strategy is likely to need to be reviewed when the remainder of the site comes forward for development. Once identified, they can then be required through the review of the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4894 - Sport England	Object	With reference to "Meeting Recreation Needs" chapter (paragraphs 12.1 - 12.39): No reference is specifically made in the sections of the chapter relating to formal sport or children's play of the needs of youth sports facilities. The Council's Recreation Study refers to the role that MUGAs and skateboard facilities play in meeting current needs in the District. Appropriate levels of provision of such facilities should also be expected in the Cambridge East development. To address this objection, a preferred approach to youth sport/recreation facilities, and associated reasoned justification, should be set out in the "Meeting Recreational Needs" chapter.	Such uses will be included in a play strategy that will be produced for Cambridge East to assist in the implementation of the public open spaces standards.	Include a requirement in CE57 for the preparation of a Play Strategy.
1881 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
2788	Support	As well as all the other facilities, I would like to make a plea for a purpose-built skateboarding and rollerblading park. Skateboarding and rollerblading seem to me to be excellent leisure activities for young people, but are too often practised on pavements or other public areas where they can be very antisocial.	Such uses will be included in a play strategy that will be produced for Cambridge East to assist in the implementation of the public open spaces standards.	Include a requirement in CE57 for the preparation of a Play Strategy.

Decision on CE60 Formal Sports Provision - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach and include a requirement for the preparation of a Play Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE61 Dual Use Sports Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
1883 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach to the point where the main indoor sports facilities should be based at the required secondary school. Dual use of such facilities is imperative. There is no compelling basis at this stage to suggest a list of necessary facilities, however tentatively. Reference to the athletics track, tennis courts and floodlit artificial pitches should be removed.	Support noted. The list of facilities detailed in the preferred approach is purely indicative, and the final list will be guided by the Strategy for Formal Sport.	
4844 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the principle of the main indoor sports facilities being based at the secondary school, as dual use indoor sports facility provision can offer a number of benefits and is consistent with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 13 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on shared use sites.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE61 Dual Use Sports Provision - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE62 Community Involvement - Preferred Approach</i>				
1193	Support	Playground access by very young cyclists. Read NCS Best Practice notes. Do not ban cycles.	Support noted. Cycle access to play areas will need to be addressed at the detailed design stages, but connectivity is an aim evident in a number of sections of the preferred options report.	
1720	Support	It is essential that all streets should have small play areas. small children need to play near home. (higher densities with smaller/no Gardens will exacerbate the problems) It is vital to avoid the situation where the only place close to home to play is in the road.	Support noted. The importance of accessible children's play spaces is acknowledged, and will be addressed in the Cambridge East Play Strategy.	
5051 - Teversham Parish Council 1884 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for this approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE62 Community Involvement - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE63 Urban Park - Preferred Approach</i>				
3945 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Object	POLICY CE63 - COMMENT English Nature would recommend the adoption of the 'Accessible Green Space Standards', and would encourage the adoption of green open space, ie areas that would have benefit to wildlife and people.	Areas of green openspace are covered in greater detail elsewhere in the preferred options report. A standard for strategic openspace is being developed for the Cambridge Sub-Region, and this will guide provision at Cambridge East.	
4835 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Does not provide sufficient justification for the removal of a further 7 ha. of land from the green belt. The functional transport benefits alluded to within the supporting text to CE63 are only minimal. The question has to be raised as to whether there are overriding financial benefits which could result from including this land within the proposed residential development thereby freeing up additional land for housing?	The relocation of the Park & Ride site into the Green Belt is consistent with the approach taken on other Cambridge Park & Ride sites which are also located in the Green Belt. If the Park & Ride site did relocate, it would offer an ideal opportunity to provide a mature town park early in the development, which would not be possible with the creation of a new facility. It is considered that a town park should be created in this area north of Newmarket Road to provide a quality recreation amenity for residents in this high density development.	
2752 - RAVE	Support	But not on the Park and Ride site.	Support in principle noted. The issue of relocation of the Park & Ride site is addressed at Option CE43.	
2704	Support	The urban park needs to provide for the needs of existing and new horseriders in the wider area, i.e. bridleways which connect to a wider network and which also are near to areas where horses are or could be kept. Bridleways can be used by cyclists, joggers, walkers, prams, etc.	The preferred approach to development principles includes the goal of developing networks of paths & cycleways, and this will apply to open spaces.	
4934	Support	Teversham is at risk from developmental attack from the south. The land between Teversham and foxgloves, and between the proposed new park and ride site and Teversham should be protected by creating a Country Park. This would help maintain Teversham's identity and character.	Support noted. The issue of a Country Park is addressed at Options CE71-73.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4853 - Sport England 2842 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 1885 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for this approach.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE63 Urban Park - Preferred Approach				
Pursue preferred approach.				

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

CE64 Green Corridor - Preferred Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2405 - The Marshall Group	Object	CE64. Marshall objects to CE64 and supports the general thrust of CE65. The required extensive green corridor can fulfil several functions, which are not mutually exclusive. Sports pitches and facilities can be compatible with landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation within the corridor. Indeed limited changing accommodation can also be provided within the corridor, operational development already regarded as appropriate in a designated green belt.	<p>In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundary in this Area Action Plan, the boundaries of the Green Corridor will also be defined. The review of the Area Action Plan will refine those boundaries if necessary once masterplanning of the Airport site is further advanced. Taking account of the approach suggested in the Preferred Options report and responses received, including comments from groups at the Stakeholder Workshop, there is general consensus on the key attributes of the Green Corridor including that it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have a minimum width of 300m - open up to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village - be landscaped in such a way that open views from the "bell mouth" around Teversham at Airport Way into the Green Corridor enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside - have lower building heights and densities on the edges of the built up area where it adjoins the "bell mouth" around Teversham - only include informal recreation and children's play areas so that the emphasis would be on its landscape, amenity and biodiversity value and have a "countryside" character. <p>Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a green corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Even if the Alternative Option were pursued, and sports pitches allowed, it would not be appropriate for the green corridor to include buildings such as changing</p>	<p>Define the Green Corridor in the AAP to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have a minimum width of 300m - open up to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village with at least 200m be maintained between any part of the new development and Teversham village. - be landscaped in such a way that open views from the "bell mouth" around Teversham at Airport Way into the Green Corridor enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside - have lower building heights and densities on the edges of the built up area where it adjoins the "bell mouth" around Teversham - only include informal recreation and children's play areas so that the emphasis would be on its landscape, amenity and biodiversity value and have a "countryside" character

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			<p>accommodation which would undermine its open character.</p> <p>A key decision will be the appropriate extent of separation from Teversham village. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with Green Belt definition and the form of the new urban quarter will determine the alignment and boundaries of the Green Corridor. Detailed work at Northstowe, on green separation between the town and adjacent villages, identified that achieving appropriate separation is not only about physical distance but also about the landscape treatment of that area. This work concluded that a minimum of 200m is required in order to provide suitable landscape treatment of various and appropriate characters. It is therefore recommended that for the purposes of this AAP, at least 200m would be maintained between any part of the new development and Teversham, again to maintain the village's setting and individual identity. This issue can be considered in more detail in the review of the AAP which will refine the Green Belt boundaries in the context of further work on the later phases of development.</p>	
4534	Object	Object to installing children's play areas that will further reduce landscape valuable for wildlife, but would accept children's education about wildlife and biodiversity.	<p>A balance needs to be found between the role of the Green Corridor for informal recreation and for landscape, wildlife and biodiversity. It is considered that the inclusion of facilities for children's play carefully located within the Green Corridor is compatible with its wider role and in view of the scale of the corridor, will not detract from its role for wildlife.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5046 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Support the creation of a green corridor linking Teversham to Coldhams Lane and Coldhams Common, but in order to make this a continuous entity, sections of Airport Way and Coldhams Lane should be put underground. Allowing green corridors to be bisected by wide roads with heavy fast moving traffic will make its use hazardous for both wildlife and humans and will deter people from accessing the area, preventing the realisations of CE51. It is also hard to see how CE66 could be achieved.	Support for the Green Corridor noted. Concerns about the existing roads that will cross the corridor are noted, however, this is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. It is therefore not inconsistent for Airport Way and Coldhams Lane to remain. However, some measures may be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife.	
5702 - Sport England	Object	With reference to "Meeting Recreational Needs" chapter (paragraphs 12.1 - 12.39): No reference is specifically made in the sections of the chapter relating to formal sport or children's play of the needs of youth sports facilities. The Council's Recreation Study refers to the role that MUGAs and skateboard facilities play in meeting current needs in the District. Appropriate levels of provision of such facilities should also be expected in the Northstowe. To address this objection, a preferred approach to youth sport/recreation facilities, and associated reasoned justification, should be set out in the "Meeting Recreational Needs" chapter.	Youth facilities such as multi use games areas (MUGAs) and skateboarding facilities are covered by the public open space standards in CE57. Such facilities are often located as part of Neaps. These will be included in a play strategy which will be developed for Cambridge East.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1194	Support	Please do not ban cycles from this area. Cycle dismount signs are virtually unique in the UK for Europe. Please look to NCS for examples of Good Practice.	Support noted. The Preferred Options report (paragraph 12.23) considers that the Green Corridor can "provide for informal recreation such as informal play, footpaths, cycle ways, and water/drainage features". Also (paragraph 12.24) that "the green corridor should be accessed from built development areas by footpaths and cycleways and provide a connection and area of interaction between the separate parts of the urban extension." Also that the green separation from Teversham should have footpath and cycleway links to the village and the surrounding countryside", to maximise its value to the wider community.	
2537 - Member of Parliament for Cambridge	Support	This green corridor is still designated as Green Belt and should therefore comply with laid down Green Belt uses. This includes informal recreation. Formal recreation should be located elsewhere within the built up area.	Support noted. However, it should be noted that open recreation uses such as sports pitches are uses that are normally acceptable in the Green Belt. There are specific reasons in this location for proposing a different approach.	
2777 - RAVE	Support	RAVE supports the retention of a Green Corridor as a result of the process of establishing the location and extent of any new development. Para. 12.23 is however too presumptive with regard to its location, scale and dimensions. The site as a whole is presently a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt and any release of land from the Green Belt should only occur in accordance with PPG 2 Annex C.	Support noted. However, the Structure Plan identifies three areas of land together making up the Cambridge East site for release from the Green Belt to provide a new urban quarter to Cambridge. The principle of the Green Belt release is therefore established. It is for the Area Action Plan to define the new boundaries of the Green Belt and the area for development within this statutory planning context.	
3116	Support	Link wildlife area on disused part of Peverel Rd allotments to green corridor, to preserve diversity of animal species there, especially muncjack deer & bird life. This is also important for the quality of life of Peverel Rd residents.	Support noted. However, the Peverel Road allotments are some distance from the proposed Green Corridor and separated from it by built development. The City Council has identified its usage as allotments as low and the site is allocated for development in the Cambridge City Redeposit Local Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6445 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the Preferred Option for the proposed green corridor.	Support noted.	
3942 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports the use of a green corridor to serve both wildlife and people. Sports pitches, although less beneficial for wildlife than more informal recreational areas, can be designed to encourage wildlife, through appropriate planting of native trees and hedges around the boundaries, the use of wider range of grassland species than those required for sports pitches, and planning design to link these hedges and grasslands to surrounding gardens and other adjacent wildlife-friendly habitat.	Support noted.	
2843 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the preferred approach	Support noted.	
2707	Support	A good bridleway network (linking to the countryside), which allows horseriding, cycling and walking are an important feature of a well designed and managed green belt.	Support noted. The supporting text to CE64 does not explicitly refer to bridleways. However, there is no reason to exclude horses on appropriate routes.	Include reference in supporting text to providing bridleways on appropriate routes.
3812 - English Heritage	Support	We support the preferred option, but suggest this is amended to encompass consideration of historic landscape character.	Support noted. However, this heavily managed airport site has very little historic landscape character remaining.	
4507 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Agree with the preferred option that the green corridors should be used for informal recreation e.g. playing fields.	Support noted. However, the Preferred Option is to allow informal recreation only and not formal sports pitches. These would be included in the Alternative Option CE65.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5206 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	Green corridors should be reserved for communication and informal recreation, and for wildlife, without compromising the sense of wildness or the area available for diverse habitats by including formal facilities such as sports pitches and their associated man made structures. Linking of green corridors to the wider path network is important, and should be explicitly recognised in the wording of the policy.	Support noted. Option CE74 addresses the importance of links to the wider countryside from all parts of the new urban quarter. This includes the green corridor.	
6052 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	Non-intrusive sports facilities would be beneficial.	Support noted. However, the Preferred Option allows informal recreation only, which does not include sports pitches. Alternative Option CE65 provides for sports facilities such as pitches.	

Decision on CE64 Green Corridor - Preferred Option

Pursue the preferred option and define the Green Corridor in the AAP to: - have a minimum width of 300m - open up to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village with at least 200m be maintained between any part of the new development and Teversham village. - be landscaped in such a way that open views from the "bell mouth" around Teversham at Airport Way into the Green Corridor enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside - have lower building heights and densities on the edges of the built up area where it adjoins the "bell mouth" around Teversham - only include informal recreation and children's play areas so that the emphasis would be on its landscape, amenity and biodiversity value and have a "countryside" character.

Include reference in supporting text to providing bridleways on appropriate routes.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE65 Green Corridor - Alternative Option</i>				
1721	Object	Formal sports pitches should not be part of the Green Corridor - they should be additional to this provision, and be within the development area.	Views noted. It is proposed to pursue the Preferred Option which does not include formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor.	
6446 - The Countryside Agency	Object	We do not support the Alternative Option for the green corridor - where it would also accommodate formal sports pitches and facilities. We share the view of the SA/SEA that this would increase the artificial feel of the space, creating a patchwork of public and natural spaces. We think that, unless the green corridor is very extensive, which seems unlikely, formal sports pitches could not be absorbed satisfactorily into what should be an informal landscape.	Views noted. It is proposed to pursue the Preferred Option which does not include formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor.	
3410	Object	The green corridor should not be developed to include sports facilities.	Views noted. It is proposed to pursue the Preferred Option which does not include formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor.	
2781 - RAVE	Object	RAVE supports the retention of a Green Corridor as a result of the process of establishing the location and extent of any new development. Para. 12.23 is however too presumptive with regard to its location, scale and dimensions. The site as a whole is presently a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt and any release of land from the Green Belt should only occur in accordance with PPG 2 Annex C.	The Structure Plan identifies three areas of land together making up the Cambridge East site for release from the Green Belt to provide a new urban quarter to Cambridge. The principle of the Green Belt release is therefore established. It is for the Area Action Plan to define the new boundaries of the Green Belt and the area for development within this statutory planning context.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5047 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Support the creation of a green corridor linking Teversham to Coldhams Lane and Coldhams Common, but in order to make this a continuous entity, sections of Airport Way and Coldhams Lane should be put underground. Allowing green corridors to be bisected by wide roads with heavy fast moving traffic will make its use hazardous for both wildlife and humans and will deter people from accessing the area, preventing the realisations of CE51. It is also hard to see how CE66 could be achieved.	Concerns about the existing roads that will cross the corridor are noted, however, this is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. It is therefore not inconsistent for Airport Way and Barnwell Road to remain. Coldhams Lane does not cross the proposed Green Corridor. However, measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4855 - Sport England	Object	Sport England would not wish to object to the principle of including formal sports facilities within green corridors, because they can be successfully incorporated in practice. However, this option is objected to, as it should recognise that as well as changing accommodation, formal outdoor sports provision may also require floodlighting, fencing and car parking provision. Playing field maintenance regimes may also compromise biodiversity objectives. To address this objection, reference should be made to these ancillary facility requirements to be met if this option is preferred in the submitted DPD.	Views noted. It is proposed to pursue the Preferred Option which does not include formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor.	
2255	Support	I would prefer that we have formal sports pitches and facilities.	Support noted.	
2406 - The Marshall Group	Support	CE65. Marshall objects to CE64 and supports the general thrust of CE65. The required extensive green corridor can fulfil several functions, which are not mutually exclusive. Sports pitches and facilities can be compatible with landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation within the corridor. Indeed limited changing accommodation can also be provided within the corridor, operational development already regarded as appropriate in a designated green belt.	Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a green corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. It is proposed to pursue option CE64. Even if the Alternative Option were pursued, and sports pitches allowed, it would not be appropriate for the green corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	
4508 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Within the green corridors priority should be given to biodiversity and informal recreation.	Support noted. CE65 proposed formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor, but only where it could do so without detracting from landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of the corridor. However, it is proposed to pursue the Preferred Option which does not include formal sports pitches within the Green Corridor.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on CE65 Green Corridor - Alternative Option

Do not pursue alternative option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE66 Crossing the Green Corridor - Preferred Approach</i>				
1722	Object	<p>CE66 is meaningless. The section of Green Corridor on the Airport site should only be crossed by motorised traffic by tunnel.</p> <p>To make the green Corridor a reality, its parts need to join physically.</p> <p>This means that sections of Airport Way, Barnwell Road and Coldhams Lane should be put underground (cut and cover tunnel?)</p> <p>A Corridor bisected by wide roads and fast traffic is a Green Corridor in name only-in reality, it is a potential death trap to humans and wildlife like.</p>	<p>Concerns about the existing roads that will cross the corridor are noted, however, this is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. It is therefore not inconsistent for Airport Way and Barnwell Road to remain. Coldhams Lane does not cross the proposed Green Corridor. However, measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2792 - RAVE	Object	Because of the function to be performed by the Green Corridor there should be no roads across it.	It is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge to be crossed by roads. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. Measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4928	Object	The green space should not be crossed by road and bus crossings - this makes a nonsense of the green space principle. There should be protection of the existing footpath around the airport. There should be a wide buffer around Teversham to keep it visually separated from the new development. (At least the same distance as exists between Teversham and the Foxgolves estate.	<p>It is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge to be crossed by roads. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. Measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor.</p> <p>It is important to retain separation between Teversham and the new urban quarter to maintain its identity. It is proposed at option CE64 that the green corridor open out to a wide "bell mouth" at Teversham with a minimum of 200m green separation is retained in this version of the Area Action Plan, to be refined when the AAP is reviewed once there is more certainty over the timing of the Airport coming forward for development and masterplanning is further advanced. The Green Corridor will remain in the Green Belt, a key function of which is to prevent coalescence of settlements.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5048 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Support the creation of a green corridor linking Teversham to Coldhams Lane and Coldhams Common, but in order to make this a continuous entity, sections of Airport Way and Coldhams Lane should be put underground. Allowing green corridors to be bisected by wide roads with heavy fast moving traffic will make its use hazardous for both wildlife and humans and will deter people from accessing the area, preventing the realisations of CE51. It is also hard to see how CE66 could be achieved.	Concerns about the existing roads that will cross the corridor are noted, however, this is not uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. It is therefore not inconsistent for Airport Way and Barnwell Road to remain. Coldhams Lane does not cross the proposed Green Corridor. However, measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor.	
4509 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Consideration should be given to underpass/footbridge crossings along the green corridor where at-grade crossings would not be appropriate (main roads). This would maintain a sense of "connectivity" along the length of the corridor. The green corridor should incorporate "green bridges" - underpasses, ditches that are appropriate for the movement of wildlife.	Provision of safe crossing points for people and wildlife will be an important consideration and can be raised in principle in the AAP. The most appropriate form and location of such crossings will be a matter for the more detailed masterplanning stage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5093 5045	Object	Oppose bus road across Coldhams Common. Green Corridors should only be accessed by foot of cycle.	This issue is addressed at option CE42 and is raised at paragraph 9.26 as an option worthy of investigation. There is no commitment to any route across Coldhams Common at this stage. However, in view of the importance of achieving a high quality public transport system to connect the new urban quarter with the rest of the City and achieve a modal shift away from the car, it is not considered appropriate to reject the option of a route along the Green Corridor at this stage.	
5094 5063	Object	Should be linked up to a semicircle of green protection, in public ownership, around Teversham, to protect the village from future pressure of expansion from Cambridge, to preserve the village in its setting and give increased access to the countryside around.	This proposal appears to be based on perceived long term threats for further expansion of Cambridge to the east. The green separation between the new urban quarter and Teversham and the wider countryside east of Airport Way will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. Option CE74 proposes an enhanced network of links to the wider countryside.	
6447 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the Preferred Approach. Road and bus crossings of the green corridor should be kept to a minimum, and where unavoidable, should be carefully designed. Consideration should be given to the use of 'green bridges' to provide continuity of space and habitat across the road.	The issue of safe crossing points for wildlife will be an important consideration for roads crossing the Green Corridor and other wildlife corridors through the development. The form of such crossings eg bridges or tunnels is a matter for the more detailed masterplanning stage.	
2845 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 1887 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
2711	Support	It is important to provide safe crossings of any roads etc. in the green belt for all pedestrians, cyclists, horseriders, and wildlife.	Support and comments noted. Provision of safe crossing points for people and wildlife will be an important consideration and can be raised in principle in the AAP. The most appropriate form and location of such crossings will be a matter for the more detailed masterplanning stage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5208 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support the need for safe crossing points over roads and busways intersecting the green corridor, and also for tunnels to allow wildlife to cross, but consider that at-grade crossings for pedestrians, cyclists and riders may not be adequate for safety. Pedestrian tunnels should also be considered at busy crossings.	Support and comments noted. Provision of safe crossing points will be an important consideration and can be raised in principle in the AAP. The most appropriate form and location of such crossings will be a matter for the more detailed masterplanning stage.	

Decision on CE66 Crossing the Green Corridor - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE67 Water Features - Preferred Approach</i>				
5050 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Concerned that areas of water should not be counted towards the required open space provision. It would seriously reduce the amount of real space available for recreation and will harm the delivery of CE58, CE59 and CE63.	Areas of water will not count towards public open space standards.	
6442 - The Countryside Agency 1888 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support the Preferred Approach for surface water management, using water as a design feature within the urban area and the green corridor.	Support noted.	
4076 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Given the lack of 'wild water' features in Cambridgeshire, any water features should include more informal areas such as reed beds.	Support and comments noted. It is agreed that any water features within the Green Corridor and outside the built up area should include more informal areas such as reed beds. However, it may be more appropriate within the urban area for a more formalised approach to water features as set out in paragraphs 12.27-12.28 of the Preferred Options report, although the benefits of including planting for biodiversity and water quality remain.	Clarify that any water features within the Green Corridor and outside the built up area should include more informal areas such as reed beds. Within the urban area a more formalised approach to water features is proposed, although the benefits of including planting for biodiversity and water quality remain.
2714	Support	Any crossings that should be built over water should take into account access for pedestrians, cyclists, and horseriders.	Support noted.	
4867 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the preferred approach, as a combination of linear water features and a large lake would provide formal and informal opportunities for watersports, which would accord with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 30 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on watersports.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE67 Water Features - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred option and clarify that any water features within the Green Corridor and outside the built up area should include more informal areas such as reed beds. Within the urban area a more formalised approach to water features is proposed, although the benefits of including planting for biodiversity and water quality remain.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE68 Landscaping Recreational Areas - Preferred Approach</i>				
4535	Object	"Naturalistic planting" should be defined.	Naturalistic planting refers to a treatment which has an informal countryside character with native rural species, rather than a more formal character whether that be parkland or more urban streetscape and may include more ornamental species. This will be included in the glossary to the Area Action Plan.	
1889 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
4077 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	More naturalistic planting should include scrub/ground cover areas.	Support noted.	
2717	Support	A sensitively and sensibly designed public right of way network (especially bridleways) is an important part of good landscaping.	Support noted. Provision of a rights of way network is a separate issue from, but not incompatible with, a well landscaped area.	

Decision on CE68 Landscaping Recreational Areas - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE69 Management of Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
4676 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the proposals for public open space to be in single ownership and for it to be managed by a trust funded by the development. However, objection is made to the lack of reference to how sports facilities (both indoor and outdoor) will be managed and maintained as it is likely that most facilities will need to be managed by the public sector and will require significant contributions from developers to ensure that they can be adequately maintained in the long term. To address this objection it is requested that "public sports facilities" be added after "incidental space".	Support for single ownership and management by a trust noted. Funding and maintenance of public sports facilities and community facilities, as well as open space, will also need to be addressed by a Management Strategy, to determine the most appropriate mechanisms.	Ensure management strategy includes funding and maintenance of public sports facilities and community facilities, as well as open space.
1723	Support	This is vital to prevent a repeat of the continuing problems experienced on the Foxgloves Estate. Adequate long term funding is essential.	Support noted.	
1890 - The Marshall Group	Support	Whilst Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach, narrow precision about funding is unnecessary. That adjustment could be achieved by an alteration to the words so that the Preferred Approach reads - The Trust or other body could be funded by commercial development. Would be changed to could.	The model detailed in the preferred approach has proved successful in other new communities. The exact funding mechanism requires further assessment to ensure it is the best and most appropriate approach. As detailed in the preferred approach, a single ownership of facilities offers significant benefits, and should be required.	Develop a criteria based policy in the Area Action Plan requiring a management plan to be approved prior to the S.46 agreement, and single ownership of facilities, but allowing greater flexibility on the exact method of management.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6448 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the Preferred Approach to open space maintenance and the proposed preparation of an appropriate management strategy as set out here. There is also the issue of securing the appropriate long term management of the land included in Landscape Strategy (CE50) that remains in private ownership to consider. It will be vitally important that robust and adequately resourced arrangements are made to deliver these proposals over the long term.	Support noted. CE53 addresses the issue of a management plan for landscape and biodiversity, which is also recognised to be integral part of the long term success of the development.	
4078 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council welcomes this statement.	Support noted.	
2846 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the preferred approach, particularly the preparation of the management plan prior to development	Support noted.	
5211 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support the single ownership modal for public open space, with management funded from commercial development; but although such funding seems appropriate for generally available facilities such as public paths, we are worried that it may prove inadequate for funding more specialised leisure facilities, for which a modal of commercial leisure provision may be more appropriate.	This issue is addressed by Preferred Approach CE25, on commercially provided services and facilities.	

Decision on CE69 Management of Open Space - Preferred Approach

Develop a criteria based policy in the Area Action Plan requiring a management plan to be approved prior to the S.46 agreement, and single ownership of facilities, but allowing greater flexibility on the exact method of management.

Ensure management strategy includes funding and maintenance of public sports facilities and community facilities, as well as open space.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE70 Phasing of the Delivery of Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
4079 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The phasing of open space should also include phasing any new/improved access to the wider countryside.	Agreed.	Clarify that the phasing of open space should also include phasing any new/improved access to the wider countryside.
4897 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports this approach, as it would ensure that the recreation facilities are delivered early in the development in order to meet the new community's needs from the outset. This would accord with sustainable development objectives and would be consistent with helping create a safe and healthy community at the outset of the development. However, the approach is objected to because it should clarify that both sport and recreational facilities should be delivered, as the current wording could be misinterpreted to imply that parks and open spaces should be delivered early but not more formal sports facilities.	The option is intended to cover the full range of recreation facilities including sports facilities. This should be clarified.	Clarify that the phased provision of sports facilities is included in the term "recreational facilities".
1891 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach on the basis that the issue of timing can be refined in necessary discussions to secure Section 46 Agreements.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE70 Phasing of the Delivery of Open Space - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach and clarify that recreational facilities include sports facilities, and add that any new/improved access to the wider countryside should also be phased through the development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE71 Countryside Recreation - Preferred Option</i>				
1726	Object	<p>The arguments for the park to be to the north of Teversham are spurious. It would not relate well to the North of Newmarket Road, due to the Road itself.</p> <p>Whilst it is important to safeguard this area, the area between Teversham and Foxgloves is even more important.</p> <p>Given the frail nature of Green Belt "protection" more lasting protection is essential for this area, by creating a public park on this land to link The Green Corridor right through to the Gogs.</p> <p>It could also link right round Teversham and include the land to the North of the Village.</p>	<p>The argument put forward for a location south of Teversham focuses on perceived protection from long term threats for further expansion of Cambridge to the east. This area will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. There is no justification for a country park of a scale that would wrap fully around Teversham village.</p> <p>The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3419	Object	I am not sure of the benefit of a country park, and I see this as creeping development that engulfs the village of Teversham. What is wrong with leaving this area as is, with access to existing footpaths etc.	The provision of a country park is an important supporting facility for a major new urban quarter to Cambridge built to a high density. The intensively farmed nature of the countryside to the east of Cambridge means that the opportunities for informal recreation in the countryside are currently limited. A country park will provide good access to the countryside for the substantial population of the new urban quarter. In addition, a network of footpaths and bridleways linking the new urban quarter with the wider countryside is proposed at option CE74.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5038 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council does not accept the preferred options of restricting the country park to either the north or south of Teversham - either of which would reduce the green space and amenities available to both old and new residents, and would increase the possibility of more development in the green areas.	<p>The area north and south of Teversham will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. The proposed country park would provide a recreation facility for residents of the new urban quarter and Teversham alike. Whilst there would be some limited ancillary buildings associated with the country park, these would be sensitively designed and located to minimise their impact on the openness of the Green Belt and protect the setting of Teversham village.</p> <p>The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	
2410 - The Marshall Group	Support	CE71. Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option that the Country Park should be provided on land north of Teversham and objects to CE72 and CE73, which see the Country Park being provided elsewhere.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4080 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2848 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support the preferred option.	Support noted.	
5214 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support the preferred location for a country park, and would wish to see it used as an opportunity to provide a safe link to countryside to the north, using Teversham Footpath 3 with a protected crossing over the Newmarket Road.	Support noted. One of the advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south is that it is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen.	
5095 5073	Support	In conjunction with CE72, with additional land on Teversham and Wilbraham Fens, to create a country park similar to that proposed at Coton.	There is no justification for a country park of a scale that would wrap fully around Teversham village as a requirement of the Cambridge East development. The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4900 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the principle of providing a country park in the development, which would link to the green corridor, as this would provide opportunities for informal recreation, and possibly some formal sports. This would accord with Sport England's policies relating to sport in the countryside and access to the countryside (Planning Policy Objectives 17,20, and 21 of Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999).	Support noted. However, whilst the country park would provide the opportunity for informal recreation and potentially a childrens' play area, it is not envisaged that it would be an appropriate location for formal sports provision. It is intended to provide an informal countryside experience.	

Decision on CE71 Countryside Recreation - Preferred Option

Pursue the Preferred Option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE72 Countryside Recreation - Rejected Option 1 - Rejected Option</i>				
4935	Object	Teversham is at risk from developmental attack from the south. The land between Teversham and foxgloves, and between the proposed new park and ride site and Teversham should be protected by creating a Country Park. This would help maintain Teversham's identity and character.	<p>The area north and south of Teversham will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. There is no justification for a country park of a scale that would wrap fully around Teversham village as a requirement of the Cambridge East development. The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5039 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council does not accept the preferred options of restricting the country park to either the north or south of Teversham - either of which would reduce the green space and amenities available to both old and new residents, and would increase the possibility of more development in the green areas.	<p>The area north and south of Teversham will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. The proposed country park would provide a recreation facility for residents of the new urban quarter and Teversham alike. Whilst there would be some limited ancillary buildings associated with the country park, these would be sensitively designed and located to minimise their impact on the openness of the Green Belt and protect the setting of Teversham village. The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5082 5074	Object	In conjunction with CE71, with additional land on Teversham and Wilbraham Fens, to create a country park similar to that proposed at Coton.	<p>There is no justification for a country park of a scale that would wrap fully around Teversham village as a requirement of the Cambridge East development. The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	
2411 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option (CE71) that the Country Park should be provided on land north of Teversham and objects to CE72 and CE73 being pursued, which would see the Country Park being provided elsewhere.	Support for the rejection of this option noted.	
4081 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support the rejection of this option.	Support for the rejection of this option noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2805 - RAVE	Support	The consideration of this land as a potential area for a Country Park, even though much of it is not part of the Airport Site highlights its strategic importance in maintaining the separation between Teversham and Cherry Hinton. The Framework documents should give additional weight to this function to ensure that separation is permanent.	<p>The area both north and south of Teversham will remain in the Green Belt as crucial areas in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. It is proposed to pursue the preferred option for a country park to the north of Teversham which has the following advantages over a location to the south of Teversham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter which will be focused on the Airport and north of the Green Corridor - It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen - It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability - It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience - If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park. 	

Decision on CE72 Countryside Recreation - Rejected Option 1 - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option 1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE73 Countryside Recreation - Rejected Option 2 - Rejected Option</i>				
2412 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option (CE71) that the Country Park should be provided on land north of Teversham and objects to CE72 and CE73 being pursued, which would see the Country Park being provided elsewhere.	Support for the rejection of this option noted.	
4082 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support the rejection of this option.	Support for the rejection of this option noted.	

Decision on CE73 Countryside Recreation - Rejected Option 2 - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option 2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE74 Access to the Countryside - Preferred Approach</i>				
991 - The National Trust	Support	Support this approach, but reference could be made to the proposed Landscape East project to provide a bridge over the A14 for improved access to Anglesey Abbey and the Wicken Fen Vision as well as other open spaces and cycle networks.	The AAP could include reference to this potential project in the supporting text, in connection with the Wicken Fen vision. There are clearly inter-relationships between the development of the new urban quarter and the proposed Bridge of Reeds, which would provide enhanced access to the north. The relationship of this evolving proposal with the possible new road access onto the A14 also needs to be taken into account in view of their potentially close proximity.	Include reference in the supporting text to the Landscape East project of the "Bridge of Reeds", in connection with the Wicken Fen vision and highlight the relationship of this evolving proposal with the possible new road access onto the A14.
1893 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the general approach but in saying that, indicates that this will rely in part upon public authorities, and possibly the National Trust, to help achieve some of the wider links.	Support and comments noted.	
6449 - The Countryside Agency 4908 - Sport England	Support	Welcome the proposal to produce a strategy too link all parts of the urban quarter to the wider countryside through a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways.	Support noted.	
4083 - Cambridgeshire County Council 926 - The National Trust 2849 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support preferred approach.	Support noted.	
2337 - swavesey & district bridleways association 2723	Support	Cambridgeshire badly needs bridleway improvements. Existing network fragmented and dead-end - puts riders and cyclists at risk on 60mph country roads. Footpath network is good but walkers only. Therefore, more bridleways is best way forward: usable by riders, cyclists and walkers; safer road-safety wise, good for tourism, enjoyment of environment. Footpaths should be upgraded to bridleways wherever possible.	Support noted. The preferred approach is for a network of footpaths and bridleways.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5215 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We strongly support CE74, but would wish to see it strongly augmented to identify the need for adequate funding. Links to the north will require improved pedestrian crossing facilities over the A1303 Newmarket Road.	Support noted. The AAP can only reasonably require provision of a network directly associated with the proposed new urban quarter. However, the strategy will look more widely at the needs of this side of Cambridge as a whole and funding will be a key consideration. Improved crossing facilities for Newmarket Road will be a consideration at the masterplanning stage.	

Decision on CE74 Access to the Countryside - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach and include reference in the supporting text to the Landscape East project of the "Bridge of Reeds" in connection with the Wicken Fen vision and highlight the relationship of this evolving proposal with the possible new road access onto the A14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
13. Land Drainage and Water Conservation				
<i>CE75 Surface Water Drainage - Preferred Option</i>				
5260	Object	This development will increase flooding in the area.	The development will need to satisfy the local planning authority and the Environment Agency that flooding will not increase as a result of the development before any planning permission is granted. There are a number of ways in which this can be achieved as set out in the Preferred Options report.	
4686 - Environment Agency	Object	Amend para 13.5 to refer to Sustainable Drainage Systems.	Agree.	Amend reference to "SUDS" in any policy and reasoned justification to "Sustainable Drainage Systems" or "SuDS".
4687 - Environment Agency	Object	Amend para 13.6, detailing requirements for Flood Risk Assessment, including surface water drainage and maintenance etc. (wording suggested).	Noted and agreed. This should be incorporated into an appropriate policy in the Area Action Plan.	Include this statement in policy: Whilst the site is not at direct risk of flooding from fluvial sources, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required to assess the surface water drainage proposals for the site which must be undertaken on a strategic scale for the site as a whole.
4683 - Environment Agency	Object	Amend wording of para 13.4 to include 'Attenuation measures must be designed to reflect the existing green field run-off rate and be able to facilitate a 1 in 100 year critical storm event (1% annual probability).'	Clarification noted and should be incorporated.	In any relevant policy or its reasoned justification, clarify that attenuation measures must be designed to reflect the existing green field run-off rate and be able to facilitate a 1 in 100 year critical storm event (1% annual probability).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6535	Object	It is stated that the area's watercourses are already at full capacity, and it is feared that the water table could be drastically affected. Can the Sewage treatment Works be expanded to cope with the massive extra demand?	The preferred option for disposal of foul sewage from this development is to pump it to Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works (STW) at Milton. Over the next decade, a major expansion in the population of Cambridge is planned, including the development described here. Anglian Water are currently carrying out an appraisal of the sewerage provision for the whole catchment. This includes an assessment of the available options for Cambridge STW. Any increase in flow from any of the existing STWs would require a re-assessment of the consent conditions to ensure that there would be no deterioration of the river quality. Anglian Water are aware of this fact. Implications of the likely increased discharge in volume from Cambridge STW would have implications for flood risk in the River Cam and this should therefore be addressed within the subsequent Flood Risk Assessment.	
6488 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Object	Parts of this proposal site drain into the Swaffham district. The board's surface water receiving system has no residual application to accept increased flows from the new developments. The district must be protected from any adverse effects. The board must be consulted on this development.	Any proposal to drain into the system for which this Board has responsibility will require consultation with that Board. The Board is on the list of those to be consulted on the Area Action Plan.	
2414 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the Preferred Option and objects to CE76, which has been rejected.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3940 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	<p>PARA 13.7 - SUPPORT</p> <p>English Nature is supportive of the acknowledgement in this paragraph that there may be water quality implications, as a result of the surface water drainage from Cambridgeshire East, upon nearby SSSIs. Both Wilbraham Fen SSSI and Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI are dependent upon incoming water to maintain their wetland habitats. Stow-cum-Quy is particularly vulnerable, as water from the Black Ditch is taken into the site to maintain levels in water bodies within the site that support dragonflies, one of the SSSIs notified features.</p>	Support noted.	
3941 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	<p>PARA 13.5 - SUPPORT</p> <p>English Nature welcomes the inclusion of the principle of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUD).</p>	Support noted.	
4510 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The approach to surface water drainage is to be supported but further opportunities to incorporate a range of SUDS measures should also be included. Swales, porous surfaces, green roofs and other measures should also be considered to provide for flood attenuation. It is important that SUDS features are incorporated within development areas, in addition to the green channels, strategic storage and receiving watercourses. An exemplar development where a range of SUDS measures is being employed is the FLOWS showcase residential project on GC16 in Cambourne.</p>	Support noted. The additional opportunities can be referred to in the explanatory text.	Ensure that reasoned justification for any policy includes reference to swales, porous surfaces, green roofs and other measures
6489 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	<p>The comments under 13.3 are noted and the statements under 13.4 are supported. With respect to 13.5, the board are concerned that any surface water infrastructure to include SuDS are maintained in perpetuity by a competent authority to ensure protection to the district.</p>	Support noted. The matter of SuDS being maintained in perpetuity is covered in the Preferred Option CE78 and amendments proposed to it which make it clear that it applies to SuDS as well as other water bodies and watercourses.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Decision on CE75 Surface Water Drainage - Preferred Option

Pursue Preferred Option, and include this statement in the policy "Whilst the site is not a direct risk of flooding from fluvial sources, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required to assess the surface water drainage proposals for the site which must be undertaken on a strategic scale for the site as a whole." Also ensure that the reasoned justification to the policy include reference to swales, porous surfaces, green roofs and other measures.

CE76 Surface Water Drainage - Rejected Option

4511 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	General support for the rejection of this option.	Noted.
2417 - The Marshall Group			

Decision on CE76 Surface Water Drainage - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE77 Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal - Preferred Approach</i>				
1894 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option.	Support noted.	
4754 - Environment Agency	Support	<p>The preferred option for disposal of foul sewage from this development is to pump it to Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works (STW) at Milton.</p> <p>Over the next decade, a massive expansion in the population of Cambridge is planned, including the development described here. Anglian Water are currently carrying out an appraisal of the sewerage provision for the whole catchment. This includes an assessment of the available options for Cambridge STW. Any increase in flow from any of the existing STWs would require a re-assessment of the consent conditions to ensure that there would be no deterioration of the river quality. Anglian Water are aware of this fact.</p> <p>Implications of the likely increased discharge in volume from Cambridge STW would have implications for flood risk in the River Cam and this should therefore be addressed within the subsequent FRA.</p>	Support and information is noted.	
Decision on CE77 Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal - Preferred Approach				

CE78 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Preferred Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE78 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Preferred Option</i>				
4691 - Environment Agency	Object	Needs to be changed to take account of the maintenance of other surface water drainage systems and SuDS, as detailed in 13.6 and CE75.	Noted. It was intended that this Preferred Option for the management and maintenance of watercourses should cover these aspects of water drainage, but any policy should make this clear.	In any policy derived from CE78, ensure that all surface water drainage systems and SuDS are clearly included as well as water bodies and watercourses.
4085 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports clear delineation of management responsibility for surface water drainage. Based on our experience with the FLOWS project at Cambourne single ownership of the system would seem preferable. The District Council does not include drainage system maintenance in its remit and Anglian Water, as a private concern, would not be a reasonable option, for the reasons given. An acceptable approach based on the Milton Keynes model, would seem to be the preferable option. Parish Councils might also take on this function with commuted funds to draw on. However in this case, it would not be an option. The scale of surface water management features at Cambridge East also indicates a need for a dedicated function.	Support for this as the Preferred Option is noted.	
2431 - The Marshall Group	Support	CE78. The maintenance of watercourses has historically been a responsibility of public authorities or statutory undertakers. The City and District Councils both have responsibilities in their respective areas for maintenance, as does Anglian Water. It would be desirable for that responsibility to continue to lie with a public authority or statutory undertaker. Nevertheless, Marshall could be supportive of the Preferred Option in circumstances where no public body is seen as appropriate.	The difficulty of the local authorities undertaking this responsibility is both a matter of resources/expertise and the problems arising from the development lying in two administrative areas. A statutory undertaker like Anglian Water presents the problems of being a commercial organisation which may not exist in perpetuity. For these reasons CE78 remains the preferred option.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Decision on CE78 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Preferred Option

Pursue Preferred Option. Ensure that in the policy derived from CE78 all surface water drainage systems and SuDS are clearly included as well as water bodies and watercourses.

CE79 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option 1 - Rejected Option

4087 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council supports clear delineation of management responsibility for surface water drainage. Based on our experience with the FLOWS project at Cambourne single ownership of the system would seem preferable. The District Council does not include drainage system maintenance in its remit and Anglian Water, as a private concern, would not be a reasonable option, for the reasons given. An acceptable approach based on the Milton Keynes model, would seem to be the preferable option. Parish Councils might also take on this function with commuted funds to draw on. However in this case, it would not be an option. The scale of surface water management features at Cambridge East also indicates a need for a dedicated function.	The County Council appears to agree that this option should be rejected.	Note.
2432 - The Marshall Group	Support	CE79. The maintenance of watercourses has historically been a responsibility of public authorities or statutory undertakers. The City and District Councils both have responsibilities in their respective areas for maintenance, as does Anglian Water. It would be desirable for that responsibility to continue to lie with a public authority or statutory undertaker. Nevertheless, Marshall could be supportive of the Preferred Option in circumstances where no public body is seen as appropriate.	The difficulty of the local authorities undertaking this responsibility is both a matter of resources/expertise and the problems arising from the development lying in two administrative areas. A statutory undertaker like Anglian Water presents the problems of being a commercial organisation which may not exist in perpetuity. For these reasons CE78 remains the preferred option.	

Decision on CE79 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option 1 - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option 1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE80 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option 2 - Rejected Option</i>				
4088 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council supports clear delineation of management responsibility for surface water drainage. Based on our experience with the FLOWS project at Cambourne single ownership of the system would seem preferable. The District Council does not include drainage system maintenance in its remit and Anglian Water, as a private concern, would not be a reasonable option, for the reasons given. An acceptable approach based on the Milton Keynes model, would seem to be the preferable option. Parish Councils might also take on this function with commuted funds to draw on. However in this case, it would not be an option. The scale of surface water management features at Cambridge East also indicates a need for a dedicated function.	The County's support for CE78 and for the rejection of CE80 is noted.	
2436 - The Marshall Group	Support	CE80. The maintenance of watercourses has historically been a responsibility of public authorities or statutory undertakers. The City and District Councils both have responsibilities in their respective areas for maintenance, as does Anglian Water. It would be desirable for that responsibility to continue to lie with a public authority or statutory undertaker. Nevertheless, Marshall could be supportive of the Preferred Option in circumstances where no public body is seen as appropriate.	The maintenance of watercourses has historically been a responsibility of public authorities or statutory undertakers. The City and District Councils both have responsibilities in their respective areas for maintenance, as does Anglian Water. It would be desirable for that responsibility to continue to lie with a public authority or statutory undertaker. Nevertheless, Marshall could be supportive of the Preferred Option in circumstances where no public body is seen as appropriate.	

Decision on CE80 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option 2 - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option 2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE81 Water Conservation - Preferred Approach</i>				
3037	Object	<p>A gap in this document is discussion of the capacity and availability of water supply for this development. Increasing the water demands of the city by 30% (plus all the other proposed developments) must have an impact. Is the supply adequate to the task especially if supplies become scarcer due to climate change?</p> <p>Is water conservation a desirable goal to be pursued or a necessity to make this development viable?</p>	<p>No objection to this development has come forth from the water supply industry. It can therefore be assumed that they are confident that adequate supply can be delivered. Water supply was an issue considered at the Structure Plan Examination in Public as part of the overall development strategy. However, this Preferred Approach recognises that water is a valuable resource which needs to be use wisely.</p>	
4089 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4695 - Environment Agency 2850 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 1895 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for this approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE81 Water Conservation - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

14. Telecommunications

CE82 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach

1896 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of the Preferred Approach. However, the authority should recognise that it is difficult to predict what may be required today by way of ducting and the like, to deal with future changes in technology requirements, many of which cannot be foreseen over the 12 year period of the Plan.	Support noted. Clearly it will not be possible to predict all future technological developments over the period of this development. However, the key factor is to build as much flexibility in to the development as possible and for later phases of development to respond to changes in technology over the period of implementation, which will extend beyond the plan period.	
4090 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support CE82.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE82 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach

Pursue the Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
15. Energy				
<i>CE83 Energy Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
3123 1045	Object	Aim should be much higher than 10% of energy from renewable energy.	10% has been established as a reasonable figure to require in other development plans, and is the target figure set in the draft East of England Plan (RSS14).	
4091 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Refer to comment on Core Strategy (CS62), it should be clear that the 10% is based on an energy use assessment after adopting energy efficient measures.	The requirement for 10% of energy to be produced by renewables will have to be in addition to the required energy efficiency standards required by Building Regulations. It has been accepted that the Area Action Plan cannot require a standard of energy efficiency above Building regulation standards.	
3694 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	It is recognised that it is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to seek to cover matters which are the subject of other legislation - in this case Building Regulations. The policy approach will therefore be to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with the emerging RSS14.	Ensure that the policy derived from this approach will require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards.
3725 - GO-East	Object	As a JOINT Area Action Plan covering the whole Cambridge East site, the AAP should not delegate policy matters directly relevant to the site to other plans. The AAP (or a subsequent review if it is not considered possible to do this for the main Airport site at this stage) should therefore set out the policies for energy provision to be applied to the site.	It is accepted that the AAP will need to include a specific policy for the development. The policies in the City Local Plan and South Cambs Core Strategy are broadly compatible and an appropriate policy will be included.	Include specific policy in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1897 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally sympathetic to the need to encourage the development of renewable energy sources. However, it objects to the imposition of an arbitrary 10% of energy requirement being met from renewable energy sources.	10% is a reasonable figure which has been established in other development plans and is set out in the draft East of England Plan (RSS14).	
4512 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports in principle the preferred approach to energy provision at Cambridge East, and welcomes the "forward thinking" approach. However, it is important that the approach is followed through into implementation and that not only minimum targets are met, but that renewable use is truly maximised.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE83 Energy Provision - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach and include specific energy provision policy in the Area Action Plan. Ensure that the policy derived from CE83 will require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but also encourage developers to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum standards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE84 Energy Conservation - Preferred Approach</i>				
2438 - The Marshall Group	Object	CE84. Marshall, whilst being sympathetic to the need to construct buildings to achieve maximum energy conservation, sees that as a function of Building Regulations rather than planning policy. It has articulated its objection to the relevant policy in the Core Strategy.	It is recognised that it is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to seek to cover matters which are the subject of other legislation - in this case Building Regulations. The policy approach will therefore be to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with the emerging RSS14.	
3631 - GO-East	Object	As a JOINT Area Action Plan covering the whole Cambridge East site, the AAP should not delegate policy matters directly relevant to the site to other plans. The AAP (or a subsequent review if it is not considered possible to do this for the main Airport site at this stage) should therefore set out the policies for energy conservation to be applied to the site. We refer to our representations on the preferred approach to energy conservation in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report.	It is accepted that the AAP will need to include a specific policy for the development. However, it is recognised that it is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to seek to cover matters which are the subject of other legislation - in this case Building Regulations. The policy approach will therefore be to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with the emerging RSS14.	Include specific policy in the Area Action Plan, consistent with response to GO-East representations to South Cambs Core Strategy.
4092 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support CE84, see comment on CS63.	However, it is recognised that it is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to seek to cover matters which are the subject of other legislation - in this case Building Regulations. The policy approach will therefore be to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with the emerging RSS14.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4696 - Environment Agency	Support	Support energy conservation measures within development.	Support noted. However, it is recognised that it is not appropriate for the Area Action Plan to seek to cover matters which are the subject of other legislation - in this case Building Regulations. The policy approach will therefore be to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with the emerging RSS14.	

Decision on CE84 Energy Conservation - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach and include specific policy in AAP relating to energy conservation, consistent with response in GO-East representations to South Cambs Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE85 Energy Conservation: Exemplar Projects - Preferred Approach</i>				
1046	Object	Surely 100% of properties to "advanced practice" is the only sustainable option? Why the compromise(s)? Surely developers profit is not the top priority!?	The AAP must be reasonable on what it can reasonably require of a development through the planning system. GO-East advise that the AAP must not seek to influence factors controlled through under legislation, such as energy conservation which is controlled through Building Regulations.	
2439 - The Marshall Group	Object	CE85. Marshall recognises the need for innovation in seeking to achieve energy efficient development. In saying that, there is a tension between increased capital cost adding to the general cost of housing.	There may not always be a tension between construction costs and higher standards of energy conservation. For example, high density housing in the form of apartments and terraced housing is more energy efficient than detached or semi-detached housing. Again matters such as orientation and design may involve no additional cost. Improved insulation may add additional cost but may be low in comparison with the overall costs of construction. Any additional capital cost to the buyer may be more than off-set by lower running costs, an increasingly attractive market matter in a situation where energy costs are likely to rise and the public becomes increasingly aware of the importance of saving energy because of climate change.	
4093 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support CE85.	Support noted.	
4513 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports in principle the preferred approach to energy efficiency. This means there should be a commitment from public bodies and the developer to implement real solutions. Moreover, there should be serious investigation of combined heat and power (CHP) or energy from waste as an integral part of the development.	Support noted. The issue of CHP is a matter for the County Council as waste planning authority and will be considered in parallel with the preparation of the AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Decision on CE85 Energy Conservation: Exemplar Projects - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.

17. Noise

CE86 Noise - Preferred Approach

2934
1224
1724

Object

The same considerations need to be given to the relocated Marshalls Aerospace.

This is a matter which cannot be included in the Area Action Plan since the relocation site will fall outside the boundaries of the Plan. However, it should be noted that Marshall's has now indicated that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, it has concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group, as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities

4094 - Cambridgeshire County Council
1899 - The Marshall Group

Support

General support for this Preferred Approach.

Support noted.

Decision on CE86 Noise - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
18. Phasing and Implementation				
<i>CE87 Site Accesses - Preferred Approach</i>				
4095 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council considers that a policy on site access should be included in the Core Strategy as it is a matter encompassing more than Cambridge East. Therefore we recommend removing policy CE87	The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	
3041	Object	This must be impossible to achieve. Existing residents are facing living near a construction site for many years. Noise and dust travel long distances.	The policy objective is to avoid disruption and nuisance to existing residents wherever possible and otherwise to minimise their effect and duration. This is acknowledged in paragraph 18.3 of the preferred options report. Planning conditions will be placed on any planning permission, governing the method of access of construction traffic to the site, include which roads can be used, at what times, which roads must not be used, and methods to minimise impacts of noise and dust.	Ensure policy in AAP makes clear that where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised in effect and duration.
1900 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE87 Site Accesses - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach, amended to make clear that where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised in effect and duration.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE88 Storage Compounds, Plant and Machinery - Preferred Approach</i>				
4096 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council considers that a policy on storage compounds, plant and machinery should be included in the Core Strategy as it is a matter encompassing more than Cambridge East. Therefore we recommend removing policy CE88.	The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	
1901 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE88 Storage Compounds, Plant and Machinery - Preferred Approach				
Pursue the preferred approach.				
<i>CE89 Construction Activities - Preferred Approach</i>				
4097 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council considers that a policy on construction activities should be included in the Core Strategy as it is a matter encompassing more than Cambridge East. Therefore we recommend removing policy CE89.	The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	
1903 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
Decision on CE89 Construction Activities - Preferred Approach				
Pursue preferred approach.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE90 Strategic Landscaping - Preferred Approach</i>				
4098 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	While tree and hedge planting is to be encouraged, the area is currently open grassland (a feature of Cambridge City and the east side of the city). This type of landscape, with improved and enhanced biodiversity value, should form part of any green space planning.	The landscape character of the countryside to the east of Cambridge will influence the strategic landscape treatment of the development, particularly on its outer edges. It is envisaged that some parts of the strategic landscaping eg within the main part of the Green Corridor will include areas more open in character while other areas will include more planting.	
6450 - The Countryside Agency 1904 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support the Preferred Approach to strategic landscaping and the early establishment of woodland, trees and hedgerow planting.	Support noted.	
2726	Support	Early landscaping, including public rights of ways (including bridleways) would allow people to enjoy the developing sites.	Support noted. Provision of public rights of way is not part of landscaping. However, there will be trigger points in the legal agreement accompanying any planning permission to bring forward key requirements of supporting infrastructure alongside the development of housing and commercial developments.	

Decision on CE90 Strategic Landscaping - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE91 Earth Moving: North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach</i>				
4100 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It should be made clear that any structural landscaping using surplus soils should be limited to clean soil resources arising only from within the development, otherwise there is a risk that mixed demolition wastes and soils will be used which will cause difficulties for establishment of landscaping and present some pollution risk.	It would clearly not be appropriate to reuse contaminated soil within the development, particularly to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the successful establishment of landscaping. Use of spoil within Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road will also need to ensure that it is appropriate for landscape character.	Make clear that reuse of soils will be limited to clean soil resources, in particular to ensure no adverse impact on the successful establishment of landscaping, and that use of spoil within Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road will also need to ensure that it is appropriate for landscape character.
4142 - Sport England	Object	With reference to paragraph 18.10 of Cambridge East AAP Preferred Options Report: Sport England supports the proposals to utilise construction spoil on site. However, objection is made to the lack of reference to how the spoil can be used for helping to construct sport and recreation facilities. For example, earth mounds can be used for creating athletics training areas and BMX cycling tracks. To address this objection, it is requested that reference be made in para 18.10 to the potential for using construction spoil to assist in providing sport and recreation.	The potential for reuse of construction spoil for recreation facilities is accepted, where this is in appropriate locations and will not have implications for landscape character. Such facilities will therefore normally be on public open spaces within the built up area rather than in the green corridor and other landscape areas. However, this should apply to the whole of the urban extension and not only to Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which is covered in CE91. This is better addressed at CE92, and should be referred to in the supporting text to that policy in the AAP.	In the supporting text to CE92, include reference that spoil can be used to help construct sport and recreation facilities, eg. earth mounds can be used for creating athletics training areas and BMX cycling tracks, where this is in appropriate locations and will not have implications for landscape character. Such facilities will therefore normally be on public open spaces within the built up area rather than in the green corridor and other landscape areas
1905 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on CE91 Earth Moving: North of Newmarket Road - Preferred Approach

Pursue preferred approach, but make clear that reuse of soils will be limited to clean soil resources, in particular to ensure no adverse impact on the successful establishment of landscaping, and that use of spoil within Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road will also need to ensure that it is appropriate for landscape character.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE92 Construction Spoil - Preferred Option</i>				
4102 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 18.9, 18.10 General support where reference is made to reprocessing steel from hangers, which in our opinion is a separate issue to earth moving. Would also suggest that reference to hazardous waste is replaced by 'waste having potentially hazardous properties' i.e. mainly contaminated soils from past industrial use.	Agreed that reprocessing steel is separate from earth moving and is better addressed under a revised CE94 which deals with recycling of building materials. Wording relating to waste with hazardous properties will be amended as recommended.	Reference to hazardous waste be replaced by "waste having potentially hazardous properties".
1914 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option, which seeks to accommodate re-using material on site.	Support noted.	
4103 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council recommends inclusion of a policy on construction waste in the Core Strategy. We support the approach; specific to Cambridge East, that inclusion of construction waste at Cambridge East should respect the landscape.	Support noted. The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	

Decision on CE92 Construction Spoil - Preferred Option

Pursue preferred option, amended to:

- include reference in the supporting text to CE91 that spoil can be used to help construct sport and recreation facilities, eg. earth mounds can be used for creating athletics training areas and BMX cycling tracks
- replace reference to hazardous waste with "waste having potentially hazardous properties"
- move consideration of reprocessing steel to a revised CE94 which deals with recycling of building materials.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

CE93 Construction Spoil - Rejected Option

4104 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council recommends inclusion of a policy on management of construction waste in the Core Strategy.	The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	
1915 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Option, which seeks to accommodate re-using material on site.	Support for rejection of this option noted.	

Decision on CE93 Construction Spoil - Rejected Option

Do not pursue Rejected Option.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE94 Recycling of Building Materials - Preferred Approach</i>				
2937	Object	It is far more efficient to continue to use than to recycle. As much of the current site should be used as possible without recycling it as hardcore.	Whilst reuse is above recycling in the waste hierarchy and this is a reasonable objective, this should not restrict the achievement of a successful development. There will be a need for considerable amounts of hardcore and other building materials for this development and reuse on site is a sustainable approach to redevelopment of the site.	
1922 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	
4105 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council recommends inclusion of a policy on preparation of Resource Reuse and Recycling Strategies in the Core Strategy.	Support noted. The policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy will only apply to that part of the development within its district. As the Cambridge East AAP is a joint plan covering land in both the City and South Cambs, it is appropriate to include a policy in the AAP specifically for this development. This is consistent with the guidance of GO-East on other issues where a coordinated approach is required.	

Decision on CE94 Recycling of Building Materials - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE95 Timing / Order of Service Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
4842 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	CE95 states that with regard to contributions "an appropriate approach will need to be identified for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road which will come forward separately to ensure it makes appropriate contributions to the requirements of the development as a whole." There is a lack of evidence or information to prove what highway requirements are needed and at what phase of development.	Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road will need to make provision for all specific requirements of that development. CE33 identifies the transport requirements for Phase 1. In addition, north of Newmarket Road will need to make provision towards those aspects of the overall development that can be identified at the time of determining a planning application. When the remainder of the development comes forward, it will need to provide for the needs of the development as a whole. In determine any application for Phase 1, it will also be crucial to ensure that its layout and form will not prejudice the achievement of a high quality development overall.	
5083 5077	Object	Meticulous planning and assessment is required to ensure that all these systems are in place prior to the commencement of building. Existing residents face years of building and upheaval on their doorsteps and everything possible should be done to minimise the impact this will have on the quality of their daily lives. This needs to be made a priority and planned accordingly.	The concerns raised are valid and the preferred approach seeks to ensure that they are addressed. The AAP will require a schedule of services to be provided and a timetable for this. It would not be reasonable or necessary to require all services, facilities and infrastructure to be provided at the start of development. However, the AAP will set trigger points as part of a legal agreement to ensure the timely provision of services.	
1925 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the Preferred Approach, which seeks to achieve the timely provision of necessary services, facilities and infrastructure.	Support noted.	
4514 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Every effort should be made to ensure that service provision is made as early as possible within the development programme.	Support noted. The AAP will require trigger points to be set as part of any planning permission to ensure the timely provision of services.	

Decision on CE95 Timing / Order of Service Provision - Preferred Approach

Pursue Preferred Approach.